

THE NATURE OF TRUTH
IN "THE GOSPEL OF TRUTH"
AND IN THE WRITINGS
OF JUSTIN MARTYR

SUPPLEMENTS TO NOVUM TESTAMENTUM

EDITORIAL BOARD

President: W. C. VAN UNNIK. Bilthoven (Utr.) Netherlands

P. BRATSIOTIS

K. W. CLARK

H. CLAVIER

J. W. DOEVE

J. DORESSE

C. W. DUGMORE

DOM J. DUPONT O. S. B.

A. GEYSER

W. GROSSOUW

A. F. J. KLIJN

PH. H. MENOUD

BO REICKE

K. H. RENGSTORF

P. SCHUBERT

E. STAUFFER

VOLUME XXV



LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL

1970

THE NATURE OF TRUTH IN "THE GOSPEL OF TRUTH" AND IN THE WRITINGS OF JUSTIN MARTYR

A STUDY OF THE PATTERN OF ORTHODOXY
IN THE MIDDLE OF THE SECOND CHRISTIAN CENTURY

BY

CULLEN I K STORY

Assistant Professor of New Testament
Director of the Summer Language Program
at Princeton Theological Seminary



LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL

1970

Copyright 1970 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

To Wilma

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments and Abbreviations.	IX
Preface	XI
Introduction.	XIII
I. An Analysis of <i>Evangelium Veritatis</i>	I
II. A Comparison of the Backgrounds of the Writer of <i>Evangelium Veritatis</i> and of Justin Martyr in Relation to the Nature of Truth	43
III. A Comparison of <i>Evangelium Veritatis</i> with the Writings of Justin Martyr in Relation to the Nature of Truth . . .	68
IV. The Nature of Truth in <i>Evangelium Veritatis</i> and in the Writings of Justin Martyr Viewed in the Light of the Bible and Early Christian Literature	177
Conclusion	220
Indexes.	224

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The following works have been used by permission of their respective publishers: The Loeb Classical Library edition of Plato (Harvard University Press), *The Gospel of Truth* and *The Language of Faith* (Abingdon Press), *The Revised Standard Version Bible* (Thomas Nelson & Sons), *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John* (Charles Scribner's Sons), *A Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.), *The Gnostic Religion* (Beacon Press Inc.), *The Theology of the Gospel of Thomas* (Harper & Row Publishers Inc.), *The Riddle of the New Testament* (Faber & Faber Ltd), *The Thanksgiving Hymns* (E. J. Brill), and *Evangelium Veritatis* (Rascher Verlag).

In addition to the texts of Justin's works and the text of *Evangelium Veritatis*, the following reference works proved to be indispensable aids: W. Bauer, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (University of Chicago Press), W. E. Crum, *A Coptic Dictionary Compiled with the Help of Many Scholars* (Clarendon Press), and E. G. Goodspeed, *Index Patristicus* and *Index Apologeticus* (J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung).

ABBREVIATIONS

A ₂	Subakhmimic Dialect of the Coptic Language
Adv. Marc.	<i>Adversus Marcionem</i> (by Tertullian)
Adv. H.	<i>Adversus Haereses</i> (by Irenaeus)
Bo.	Bohairic Dialect of the Coptic Language
D.	Justin's Dialogue with Trypho
Ev. Ver.	<i>Evangelium Veritatis</i>
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
I.	Justin's First Apology
II.	Justin's Second Apology
IDB	The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JBR	The Journal of Bible and Religion
JR	The Journal of Religion
JTS	The Journal of Theological Studies
NEB	The New English Bible
NTS	New Testament Studies
qual.	qualitative
RHR	Revue de L'Histoire des Religions
RSV	Revised Standard Version
Sah. (sa.)	Sahidic Dialect of the Coptic Language

<i>Strom.</i>	<i>Stromata</i> (by Clement of Alexandria)
<i>TDNT</i>	Theological Dictionary of The New Testament (English translation of <i>TWNT</i>)
<i>ThL</i>	Theologische Literaturzeitung
<i>TWNT</i>	Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament
<i>VC</i>	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
<i>ZNTW</i>	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft

PREFACE

Eight years ago, the subject of the following work was suggested to the writer by Dr. Otto A. Piper, then Professor, now Professor Emeritus, of New Testament Literature and Exegesis at Princeton Theological Seminary. The writer owes much to Dr. Piper. His friendship, his rich Biblical and theological acumen, and his devotion to the gospel have been the writer's daily encouragement throughout the past decade. Due to that encouragement, the manuscript was submitted originally in 1964 as a doctoral dissertation. It is presented now in a revised and expanded form.

According to a passage in the Fourth Gospel, Pontius Pilate once asked Jesus, "What is truth?" The text suggests that the ruler asked his question without serious intent since he failed to wait for an answer. Modern man often lives without even raising the ruler's question. He assumes that truth is known, that it is right not wrong, fact not fiction. Seldom, however, does he sense that truth can play a vital role in his moral and spiritual life or that there are norms by which truth can be established. E. Hoskyns and F. Davey find that our scientific age claims truth as an ultimate standard but recognizes no standard by which truth itself is determined. They tell us:

"A statement is commonly held to be true if it accords with the simplest explanation of the facts, with the experience of the race or of the individual, or with the supposed nature or fitness of things. A man is said to be true to his principles, to his religion, to type, or to himself."¹

To use the word "true" and to use it legitimately, some norm or standard is needed. Is the standard to be God? Christ? the Bible? Or is man himself the true measure of all things?

Investigations into the meaning of truth are numerous. To the research of others, the writer now adds his own work, a study of the pattern of truth in the church of the second century including its inherent connections with the Biblical witness to truth. As a *raison d'être* of his work, the writer is convinced that the idea

¹ *The Riddle of the New Testament* (London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1931, 1st ed.; Plymouth: Latimer Trend & Co Ltd, 1947, 3rd ed.), p. 27.

of truth in the second century has clear implications for the church of today.

Research into the second century, the period of the apologists and martyrs, contains its own challenge and excitement. One facet of the writer's research has been the works of Justin Martyr, apologist of the Christian faith and martyr for Christ. New interest in the period was aroused, however, with the publication (1956 and 1961) of a Coptic version of *Evangelium Veritatis*, the original text of which appeared most probably in Justin's own time. The Coptic document itself is the second main facet of the writer's research. Without doubt, *Evangelium Veritatis* as well as other published manuscripts from Nag Hammadi have helped to make Coptic studies an important part of the equipment of the modern New Testament student. In this regard, the writer expresses his thanks to Dr. Bruce M. Metzger, Professor of New Testament Language and Literature of Princeton Seminary, who first introduced him to the Coptic language and literature. Professor Bertil Gärtner, kindly read several portions of the writer's manuscript in its original form and offered some suggestions for its revision. A number of his suggestions have been incorporated into the present form of the work. The writer himself, however, is solely responsible for any errors which the work may contain.

A special word of appreciation goes to the president and board of trustees of the Seminary for assistance in putting the manuscript into print. Thanks are due also to the firm of E. J. Brill for their patience and concern with detail. Finally, to his wife and three sons, the writer expresses his gratitude for their constant understanding and encouragement.

CULLEN I K STORY

Princeton, N. J.
1970

INTRODUCTION

Justin Martyr¹ and the writer of *Evangelium Veritatis*² wrote their respective works about the middle of the second Christian century. A date of 150-155 for Justin's First Apology is assured by a comparison of the Apology with documents which date for the most part in the reign of Antoninus Pius (A. D. 138-161), to whom and to whose adopted sons, Verissimus and Lucius, Justin addressed his plea (I. 1:1). The evidence from the Apologist revolves around two passages in Apology I, first, I. 46:1, where Justin dates Christ's birth 150 years earlier, and second, I. 29:2, where Justin refers to a certain Felix as prefect of Alexandria at the time the Apologist is writing. A number of papyri establish the date of the prefecture of this Felix with considerable certainty.

¹ The text of Justin's two Apologies and his Dialogue with Trypho (= the three extant works of the Apologist which are accepted as genuine) depends largely on Codex Regius Parisinus, CDL (A. D. 1364) titled manuscript A by Johann Karl Theodor von Otto, *Justini Philosophi et Martyris Opera*, vol. I, part I (Jena: Prostat in Libraria, Hermann Dufft, 1876), pp. xxi-xxiii. Manuscript B (A. D. 1541), Codex Claromontanus, LXXXII, is an inferior copy of A (cf. Otto, *ibid.*, xxiii-xxvii). Independent witnesses to the text of the Apologist's writings are found in Codex Ottobonianus Graecus, CCLXXIV (15th century) which contains Apol. I. 65-67, and in Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, IV, 17:1-13 which contains the whole of Apol. II. 2. Cf. the text edited by G. Bardy, *Eusèbe de Césarée, Histoire ecclésiastique*, I-IV, 193-195 (Paris: Les éditions du Cerf, 1952). A seventeenth century ms, Codex Parisinus Supplementi Graeci, CXC, contains portions only of Justin's works (cf. Otto, *ibid.*, pp. xxviii-xxix). Two Latin versions of Apol. I. 65-67 are of minor value. Cf. A. W. F. Blunt, *The Apologies of Justin Martyr* (Cambridge: University Press, 1911), pp. lii-liii. Recently a ms of Justin's Dialogue with Trypho (ms P) has been described and collated (in part) by Walther Eltester, "Bericht über eine neue Justinhandschrift auf dem Athos," *Texte und Untersuchungen*, 77 (1961), 161-176. The ms is undoubtedly the same as Robert Curzon Zouche mentioned in his *Visits to Monasteries in the Levant*, a book originally published in 1849 but recently reprinted (London: A. Barker, Ltd., 1955). Eltester's collation covers only pp. 99-118 (D. 7:1-25:2) of the text of E. J. Goodspeed (*Die ältesten Apologeten*), against which the collation is made. The differences of ms P from Goodspeed's text are generally insignificant. Thus, ms A remains the basic source for Justin's works. Various printed texts besides those of Otto and Goodspeed will be mentioned in the following pages.

² The only extant manuscript of this work dates apparently from the late fourth Christian century. It is one of the most important documents among the Coptic writings discovered about 1945 near the modern Egyptian city of Nag Hammadi. Written in the Subakhmimic (A₂) Coptic Dialect, the

(1) In 1896, Sir Frederick Kenyon¹ identified the Felix of Apol. I. 29:2 with a Munatius Felix who succeeded the prefect Honoratus.²

(2) Berlin Papyrus 265, also mentioned by Kenyon³, shows Honoratus to have been prefect in A. D. 148. Kenyon's statement that Honoratus was at the beginning of his office, may be true though it depends upon a conjectured textual restoration, i. e. [τοῦ ἐνε]στῶτος in line 15 of the papyrus.⁴ If the restoration is correct, Felix, the successor of Honoratus, can hardly have taken office earlier than 150.

(3) Another papyrus, dated A. D. 186, mentions a trial held in A. D. 151 before the prefect of Egypt, Munatius.⁵

(4) Another Berlin papyrus (no. 448) gives the first name of the prefect Munatius Felix as Lucius. The reading without restoration is as follows: Λουκίω Μουν [...] ἐπάρχῳ Αἰγύπτου.⁶

ms (except for four missing pages) was edited by M. Malinine, H.-Ch. Puech, and G. Quispel, and published with full-size photographic facsimiles in a deluxe edition in 1956, *Evangelium Veritatis* (Zürich: Rascher Verlag). The missing pages were first identified and translated by H.-M. Schenke in *ThL*, 83 (1958), no. 7, pp. 497-500. Schenke showed that the four pages (= two papyrus leaves) which had become separated from the main part of the manuscript, were to be identified with plates 9 (= *Ev. Ver.*, p. 33), 10 (= *Ev. Ver.*, p. 34), 6 (= *Ev. Ver.*, p. 35), and 5 (= *Ev. Ver.*, p. 36) in a volume of small-size photographic facsimiles, edited by Pahor Labib, *Coptic gnostic papyri in the Coptic museum at Old Cairo*, vol. I (Cairo: Government press, 1956). W. Till collaborated with Malinine, Puech, and Quispel in editing the text of the missing pages, i.e. *Evangelium Veritatis, Supplementum* (Zürich: Rascher Verlag, 1961). For the history of the discovery of the Coptic works, cf. J. Doresse, *Les Livres secrets des Gnostiques d'Égypte* (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1957) and W. C. van Unnik, *Evangelien aus dem Nilsand* (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Heinrich Scheffler, 1960), pp. 9-26.

¹ In a letter published by *The Academy* of Feb. 1, 1896, p. 98.

² The names of the prefects occur in lines 17 and 15 respectively of papyrus 358 in *Greek Papyri in the British Museum*, II (Oxford: University Press, 1898). Kenyon cites the name as Lucius Munatius Felix though only the second and third names appear in this papyrus (*ibid.*, pp. 171f.).

³ In his letter to *The Academy* (see footnote 1 above).

⁴ *Aegyptische Urkunden aus den Koeniglichen Museen zu Berlin, Griechische Urkunden*, I (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1895), page 264 (no. 265).

⁵ *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, II (Oxford: University Press, 1899), no. 237, col. VIII, line 20 (p. 163, cf. also pp. 174-175). Goodenough, *The Theology of Justin Martyr* (Jena: Verlag Frommannsche Buchhandlung, 1923), p. 81, remarks that this papyrus "definitely gives Felix's date of accession as 151." Goodenough probably refers to Berlin papyrus, no. 265 (see above), since the Oxyrhynchus papyrus has no reference to the beginning of Munatius' prefecture.

⁶ *Aegyptische Urkunden aus den Koeniglichen Museen zu Berlin, Griechische Urkunden*, II, 107, lines 5-6.

(5) Kenyon¹ cites another papyrus which mentions a prefect Lucius of the reign of Antoninus Pius, probably the same as Felix.²

Thus, since the evidence points to the years 150 (151)-154 for the prefecture of Felix, the First Apology of Justin may be dated with considerable certainty between the years 152-154.³

The Second Apology lacks the definite dating of the First. The occasion of the Second Apology was the persecution of Christians under the prefect of Rome, Urbicus (II. 1:1, 3; 2:9, 12, 15, 16). This man is probably to be identified with Lollius Urbicus who was a victorious governor of the province of Britain in 138-139 and who, while there, built the Antonine Wall.⁴ At least one inscription mentions that Lollius Urbicus was prefect of the city (i.e. Rome).⁵

The best information on the date of the Dialogue is given in the Dialogue itself, where (D. 120:6) Justin alludes to his First Apology. The Dialogue, therefore, must be later than the year 154-155. It is not possible to be more precise than this.

The dating of *Evangelium Veritatis* depends largely on two passages in the works of Irenaeus. The first is found in *Adv. H.*, III, 11:9 where Irenaeus declares that those who are from Valentinus have put forward their own composition, glorying in their possession of more gospels than there really are. Irenaeus says,

Siquidem in tantum processerunt audaciae, uti quod ab his non olim conscriptum est, veritatis Evangelium, titulent, in nihilo conveniens Apostolorum Evangeliiis, ut nec Evangelium quidem sit apud eos sine blasphemia. Si enim quod ab eis profertur, veritatis est Evangelium, dissimile est autem hoc illis, quae ab Apostolis nobis tradita sunt; qui volunt, possunt discere, quem-

¹ *Greek Papyri in the British Museum*, II, 171.

² *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecorum*, III, 4863, col. III, lines 7-9 reads ἐπὶ Λουκίου . . . ἐπαρχοῦ Αἰγύπτου ἐπ' ἀγαθῶ . . . Ἀντωνίου Καίσαρος. Cf. also papyrus 75 in *Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester*, II, 24-25, col. I, lines 6, 18-19, where a prefect Munatius offers a judicial decision in the 13th year of Antoninus Pius.

³ The occasion for the mention of Felix in I. 29:2 was a petition which a young Christian man submitted to the prefect asking for permission to be made a eunuch. The prefect denied the request. Some time must be allowed for the news of the incident to reach Rome where Justin apparently wrote his Apology.

⁴ *Cambridge Ancient History*, XI (Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1936), 336.

⁵ *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, VI (Berolini: G. Reimerum, 1876), 6, no. 28.

admodum ex ipsis scripturis ostenditur, jam non esse id quod ab Apostolis traditum est veritatis Evangelium.¹

In a number of ways, the text of Irenaeus points directly to the text of the document, known today as *Evangelium Veritatis* (*Ev. Ver.* hereafter).

(1) There is the evidence of the name of the gospel. Irenaeus says that the successors of Valentinus title their work, *veritatis Evangelium*. The title constitutes the first two words of the Coptic document, *Ev. Ver.* (ⲡⲉⲧⲁⲩⲣⲉⲗⲓⲟⲛ ⲛⲧⲁⲛⲉ, 16:31). The two words apparently describe not only the contents of *Ev. Ver.*, but form its title as well.²

(2) Irenaeus' statement that *veritatis Evangelium* agrees in no way at all with the gospels of the apostles, is a valid observation, if *Ev. Ver.* is meant. As an analysis of *Ev. Ver.* will show,³ the problem throughout this unique document is how to relate it to the New Testament gospels.

(3) Irenaeus' charge that his opponents while claiming a "gospel of truth" actually possess no gospel that is free from blasphemy, can be evaluated and understood when one considers the whole

¹ Text of W. W. Harvey, *Sancti Irenaei*, II, 52.

² Hans-Martin Schenke in *Die Herkunft des sogenannten Evangelium Veritatis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959), pp. 13 f., has seriously challenged this position. He feels that the editors of *Ev. Ver.* have actually been deceived by the initial words. Far from being a title, says Schenke, the first two words merely begin a sentence which—for the writer—describes the message of salvation brought by Jesus. Schenke adds that the descriptive genitive "of truth" is not unique in the Coptic document for it occurs also in "Father of truth" (16:33) and "letters of truth" (23:8-9). Grammatically, Schenke's view carries with it a certain weight. The question remains, however, whether Irenaeus (*Adv. H.*, III, 11:9) would have been grammatically so astute. In view of the fact that, in his preceding paragraph (III, 11:8), Irenaeus discovers the character of the four canonical gospels in the opening words of each (he leaves Luke's preface, 1:1-4, out of his consideration), it is quite possible that in his following section (III, 11:9), he actually refers to *Ev. Ver.* and makes a similar discovery. That is, quite apart from any syntactical relation which the opening words of *Ev. Ver.* have to the words which follow, Irenaeus may intend to single out the phrase "The gospel of truth" as both a title and a description of the content of the work—at least as far as the writer of *Ev. Ver.* sees its content. A careful reading of *Ev. Ver.* itself shows that the writer is convinced that he knows the truth of God's redemption and that he is concerned to share the truth with the initiates (or potential initiates) of his faith. He possesses not only a gospel but "the gospel of truth." For further consideration of the issue, see the discussion on p. 51, note 4.

³ Cf. what follows in chapter one.

new concept of the gospel that *Ev. Ver.* contains. Ideas such as ignorance, knowledge, lack, rest, error, forgetfulness, completeness, existence, occupy the writer's mind from the beginning of *Ev. Ver.* on through to its end. At the same time, the central ideas of the gospel, according to the New Testament, are either missing from *Ev. Ver.* or completely transformed in meaning.

The entire paragraph from Irenaeus carries with it a strong impression that he is describing *Ev. Ver.*, in its original Greek form—no longer extant—preserved, however, in the Coptic document (Subakhmimic dialect) that has recently been published. If this is true, then on the basis of Irenaeus' words, *non olim conscriptum est*, *Ev. Ver.* may be dated a little after the middle of the second century.

A second passage that leads to the same conclusion is found in *Adv. H.*, II, 24:6. The passage deals with the parable of the lost sheep as it is understood in gnostic circles. The various details of the parable as the Gnostics interpret it, according to Irenaeus, approximate the text of *Ev. Ver.* 32:9-17 and indicate that the bishop of Lyons is referring to *Ev. Ver.*¹

Having determined with some precision the respective dates of the writings of Justin and of *Ev. Ver.*, i.e. a few years later than the middle of the second century, it is important to realize that in at least two areas, a comparison of the works of the two writers may yield some definitive results on the meaning of orthodoxy and truth in the mid second century church.

The first area is that of truth and the Bible. Both writers stand in time at the middle or near the close of what may be called a transition period—between the time when the apostolic writings were produced and the time when these writings were formed into a canon which became authoritative for the church, i.e. the New Testament. Church fathers such as Clement (ca. A.D. 95) and Ignatius (ca. 110) stand at the beginning of the transition period while Irenaeus (fl. 180), Tertullian (fl. 190), and an unknown writer (ca. 192-193) refuting Montanism,² stand at the close. Clement

¹ Cf. chapter three below, but more particularly, H.-Ch. Puech and G. Quispel, "Les Écrits gnostiques du Codex Jung," *VC*, VIII (1954), 22-39.

² Cf. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* V, 16:3. The words of the writer as recorded by Eusebius, refer to ὁ τῆς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου καινῆς διαθήκης λόγος, to which the unknown writer adds, "it is not possible to add to or take away anything from," i.e. from the *diathēkē*. Cf. the text of G. Bardy, *Eusèbe de Césarée, Histoire ecclésiastique*, V-VII, 46.

and Ignatius (cf. also the Didache and Polycarp's letter to the Philippians) base their respective letters on Divine revelation in the Old Testament and the dawning of a new age of fulfillment in Christ's coming. They implicitly accept an Old Testament canon but their works contain only a few definite references or quotations (allusions are more frequent) to the gospels and epistles of the New Testament.¹ More specific than their recognition of the authority of New Testament writings was their recognition of the authority of the apostles. Clement calls on the church at Corinth to remember the steadfastness of Peter and Paul (1 Clem. 5:3-7). Ignatius takes pains to distinguish himself from his predecessors: Peter and Paul were apostles, Ignatius a condemned man.²

Theodore Zahn was convinced that the canon of the New Testament arose early in the second century through both public and private reading of the various New Testament books. That is, reading of the books demonstrated their canonicity.³ In criticizing Zahn's view, A. Harnack affirmed that the canon originated later when the church became conscious that the idea of a new covenant (cf., e.g. Luke 22:20; 2 Cor. 3:6; Hebr. 8:8 [in quotation]) demanded a new document to mark out Christ's unique position.⁴ Harnack goes too far in attributing the origin of the canon to the anti-Montanist attitude of church leaders. Two things, however, are clear. First, there was a time when there was no New Testament. Second, by the time of Irenaeus and Tertullian, the church is definitely related to New Testament writings in the same way

¹ E.g., 1 Clem. 47:1, "Take up the epistle of the blessed Paul, the apostle," and IEph 19 (cf. Matt. 2). The writer of the Didache uses more NT quotations than the other three.

² IRom 4:3, ἐκεῖνοι ἀπόστολοι, ἐγὼ κατάκριτος. Cf. H. E. W. Turner, *The Pattern of Christian Truth: A Study in the Relations between Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Early Church* (London: Mowbray & Co. Ltd, 1954), p. 245.

³ Theodore Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, 2 vols. (Erlangen: A. Deichert, 1888). A. Harnack, *The Origin of the New Testament and the Most Important Consequences of the New Creation*, trans. J. R. Wilkinson (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1925), p. 219, protests the title of Zahn's work. He says that the title should be, "*History of the public and private use of works that were afterwards united in the New Testament.*"

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 37. Cf. W. C. van Unnik, "Ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη— a Problem in the early history of the Canon," *Texte und Untersuchungen*, 79 (1961), 226. As far as the word "covenant" is concerned, van Unnik shows that the first unambiguous use of the word referring to Christian books "is found in a refutation of Montanism by an anonymous author, writing in 192/193" (*ibid.*, p. 217). Cf. (also by van Unnik) "De la Règle Μήτε προσθεῖναι μήτε ἀφελεῖν dans l'histoire du Canon," *VC*, III (1949), 1-36.

in which both church and synagogue had become related to the Old Testament. The New Testament along with the already-accepted Old Testament has become regulative and authoritative literature for the church. That is, the church has a canon.

Prior to the canonical status which the New Testament writings were to acquire was a period in which the church recognized the authority to be found in the sayings of Jesus as recorded in the gospels, and by extension, the authority to be found in the writings of the apostles whom Jesus commissioned. Justin Martyr and the writer of *Ev. Ver.* appear on the scene precisely in the closing part of the transitional period. The recurring formula in Justin's works, "The Lord said," or "He said" (cf., e.g. I. 15:1 ff.) reflects the transitional stage with respect to the gospels of the New Testament.¹ *Ev. Ver.* has a similar formula, e.g. "He spoke the word" (*Ev. Ver.* 19:19-20). The writer fails, however, to express the content of any single logion of Jesus. Justin's acknowledgment of the authority of New Testament epistles and apocalypse is less apparent than his reference to the gospels. There is, however, one definite reference to John and the twentieth chapter of the Revelation (D. 81:4). Furthermore, B. F. Westcott once demonstrated that the quotations of Justin from the Old Testament which also occur in the Pauline letters, frequently coincide in textual form with the text of Paul as against the LXX.² As for the relationship of *Ev. Ver.* to other parts of the New Testament, to say the least, it is vague. The writer indeed uses the various New Testament letters and the Apocalypse of John, in fact, his work is replete with a great number

¹ The claim of Irenaeus that there are four gospels, no more and no less (*Adv. H.*, III, 11:8), is not found a generation earlier. Justin claims that the "memoirs, called gospels" are read frequently at the Sunday worship service (I. 67:3, cf. 66:3). Even if the text of Justin be interpreted to mean the four-fold gospel, the fact that the reading from the memoirs alternated from Sunday to Sunday with the reading from the prophets (I. 67:3), makes it difficult to affirm that the four gospels enjoyed "canonical" status in Rome at the time of Justin.

² *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament* (Cambridge: Macmillan & Co., 1855), pp. 204 f. A good illustration is found in D. 95:1 and 96:1 where Justin cites texts found respectively in Deut. 27:26 and 21:23. The two texts are also cited by Paul in his letter to the Galatians (3:10, 13). Paul's quotations differ considerably from the text of the LXX, while, except for two minor changes (i.e. ἐν τοῖς [D. 95:1] for πᾶσιν τοῖς [Gal. 3:10]), Justin's quotations of the Old Testament agree exactly with the Greek text (cf. Nestle) of Gal. 3:10, 13. Even the order of citation of the two passages is the same in the two writers !

of suggestions of, or allusions to, the New Testament. But apparently, neither for him¹ nor for Justin is there a New Testament canon. In a sense, this is not strange. The indifference to be found among Alexandrian Christians to a well-defined New Testament canon is a fact. Even in the time of Clement and Origen (i.e. the late second and early third centuries) one discovers several references to the gospel according to the Egyptians and the gospel according to the Hebrews.² Similarly, Justin does not hesitate to link the Sibylline Oracles and the prophecies of the Persian, Hystaspes, with the books of the Old Testament prophets. In I. 44:12 (cf. 20:1) he plainly states that Christians read all of these works. At the same time he encourages the Roman rulers and people to read these works so as to know what they say. Thus, the evidence from both writers, Justin and the writer of *Ev. Ver.*, does not point to any fixed canon of the New Testament. There is a New Testament in the making, not yet in reality.

A comparison of the writings of Justin and *Ev. Ver.* may be profitable also from the standpoint of the relation of truth to speculative thought in the middle of the second century. *Ev. Ver.* implicitly, and the writings of Justin explicitly, reveal a positive attitude to philosophical thought.³ Both are intent upon making the truth of the gospel—each in his own way—palatable to the intelligentsia of their day, Justin to those outside, the writer of *Ev. Ver.* to those inside, the faith. This was a new venture in Christianity. In a very definite sense, Justin's writings reveal a missionary outlook. New Testament literature (gospels, acts, epistles) had been addressed to Christians irrespective of their level of education. The same holds true for the early Fathers—Clement, the writer of the *Didache*, Ignatius, and Polycarp—who wrote to all Christians and affirmed the truth of God as they

¹ The basic interest of the writer of *Ev. Ver.* is not in books or apostles but in his own authority.

² Cf. Clem., *Stromata*, III, 9 (63:1-2); 13 (93:1) for references to the gospel according to the Egyptians. Cf. the text of Otto Stählin, *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*, Clemens Alexandrinus, vol. II (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906), 225, 238. For references to the gospel according to the Hebrews, cf. Clem., *Stromata*, II, 9 (45:5) in the text of Stählin, *ibid.*, 137, and Origen, *Commentary on John*, book II, 12 (87), in the text of Erwin Preuschen, *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*, Origenes Werke, IV (1903), p. 67, et al.

³ Cf. chapter two.

understood it. Now, however (A.D. 155), the situation is different. Justin senses the need of giving a rationale for the gospel. For the Apologist, this means a special emphasis on the Logos and the development of a new "holy history" that leads from the Greek sages to Jesus Christ.

For the writer of *Ev. Ver.*, the intelligentsia are those who belong—actually or potentially—to the fold of believers. Christ "breathes into the faithful that which exists in the divine thought."¹ The writer shows a significant disregard for history and, at the same time, a radical concern to understand and interpret the "gospel of truth." J. Leipoldt² has said that an Alexandrian Christian, though discerning a difference in *Ev. Ver.* from New Testament writings, could have read the document without taking offense. Irenaeus was later to take strong offense to it, no less than Justin would have done if Justin had known and read *Ev. Ver.*

What all of this may say, is that the relation of truth to speculative thought in the mid second century, may have varied in different places just as the relation of truth to the Bible varied since the New Testament canon was not fixed. It is the purpose of the following work to explore these two important areas of concern—truth and the Bible and truth and speculative thought—by an examination of *Ev. Ver.* and the writings of Justin Martyr.

The plan of the work is as follows. Chapter one consists of an analysis of *Ev. Ver.* Only by a serious attempt to understand the main ideas of *Ev. Ver.* and the movement of the author's thought is one in a position to evaluate the contribution of this document to other writings—in our investigation, to the writings of Justin Martyr.³ Such an analysis may include word-statistics which will facilitate the grasp of important terminology in the document. Thus, the frequent occurrence in *Ev. Ver.* of terms such as Father,

¹ Samuel Laeuchli, *The Language of Faith* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), p. 46.

² "Das 'Evangelium der Wahrheit,' " *ThL*, 82 (1957), 833. Leipoldt's article (*ibid.*, 826-834) contains a report of the find of the document, comments, but no translation.

³ No attempt is made to relate *Ev. Ver.* either to the second and third century Gnostic systems—in general—which have been analyzed thoroughly by E. de Faye, *Gnostiques et Gnosticisme* (Paris: Librairie orientale P. Geuthner, 1925), or to the Valentinian Gnostic system—in particular—which has been examined carefully by F.-M.-M. Sagnard, *La Gnose valentinienne et le Témoignage de Saint Irénée* (Paris: Librairie philosophique: J. Vrin, 1947).

truth, being and becoming, call, come forth, manifest, word, completeness (= perfection), name, and of course, the terms knowledge and to know, indicate for the reader what terms its writer finds important. A study of words and word-frequency, however, will not of itself open the gates of understanding to *Ev. Ver.* Thus, in the analysis of chapter one of this work, an attempt is made to explain *Ev. Ver.* methodically, section by section, allowing its basic message to appear as clearly as possible. The particular question addressed to *Ev. Ver.* is, "What is the nature of truth?" The answer to be found in *Ev. Ver.* appears in the writer's understanding of the Father and of Christ, of the cosmos and evil, of man and his redemption. The analysis of *Ev. Ver.* aims to let the document speak freely on these critical areas, so vitally related to the nature of truth. In accomplishing this aim, discussion of textual matters is confined to those passages where an important issue is at stake. A much more thorough treatment of various emphases in *Ev. Ver.* such as its parables and its concern with the work of Christ, will appear in chapter three. Thus, the analysis of *Ev. Ver.* is a necessary base. But an analysis is necessary for another reason. Up until now, as far as the writer knows, the task has not been done. The text, of course, is available. In addition to the French, German, and English translations which were included with both the *Ev. Ver.* text and the *Supplementum*, other translations have appeared.¹ Besides the translations, various explanatory notations have been published which aim to clarify ambiguities in the text. Among these are the *notes critiques* which accompanied the *Ev. Ver.* text and the *Supplementum* and the notes which are found at the foot of each page of Schenke's translation. Of particular worth are the succinct notations of W. C. Till,² containing comments directed particularly to the German translation, critical notes, and glossary, in the text of *Ev. Ver.* which was published in 1956. Till's skill as a Coptic scholar is known to be second to none. After the identification of the "missing pages" of *Ev. Ver.*, Till

¹ H.-M. Schenke, *op. cit.*; W. C. Till, "Das Evangelium der Wahrheit," *ZNTW*, 50 (1959), 165-185; K. Grobel, *The Gospel of Truth: A Valentinian Meditation on the Gospel, Translation from the Coptic and Commentary* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960); W. W. Isenberg, "The Gospel of Truth," in *Gnosticism; a source book of heretical writings from the earliest Christian period*, ed. R. M. Grant (New York: Harper & Bros., 1961).

² "Bemerkungen zur Erstausgabe des 'Evangelium veritatis,'" *Orientalia*, N. S., 27 (1958), 269-286.

published his own text of these pages together with a German translation, an introduction, and glossary of terms.¹ The notations which the late K. Grobel included with his translation were the first to be published in English. Helpful though these notations are, they are disconnected and fail to show exegetically and theologically the movement of the thought of the writer of *Ev. Ver.* One of the most recent "commentaries" is that of Jacques E. Ménard.² Ménard's work includes the unique feature of a re-translation of the Coptic text back into Greek, along with an accompanying French translation. His commentary is a veritable mine of information, but like the commentary of Grobel, it does not allow the form and structure of *Ev. Ver.* to stand out in any concrete way. Thus, notwithstanding the various aids to an understanding of the Coptic text of *Ev. Ver.*, an analysis of this document is still necessary. The purpose of chapter one of this work is to give such an analysis. The situation with respect to the works of Justin Martyr is entirely different. His works were known and used by Irenaeus, quoted by Eusebius, and have been edited, translated, and analyzed, from Reformation days down to the present. A new analysis of Justin's works was not considered necessary for this book. Chapter one, therefore, is limited to a consideration of *Ev. Ver.*

Chapter two relates to the philosophical and Christian backgrounds of Justin and the writer of *Ev. Ver.* This chapter is concerned with the extent to which philosophical and Christian thought influenced the two writers in their understanding of truth.

Chapter three is the main chapter of the book. It consists of five propositions designed to facilitate a comparison of the two writers in their understanding of truth—Christian truth. At the close of the treatment of each proposition, a brief summary and comparison of the views of each writer appears.

Chapter four opens up another avenue of comparison of the two writers, a comparison with the Bible and early Christian literature. This chapter has to do with the broad lines of development in the understanding of the nature of truth both in the Bible and in some important works of the early Fathers (Clement, the writer of the *Didache*, Ignatius, and Polycarp). Is there a

¹ "Die Kairener Seiten des Evangeliums der Wahrheit," *Orientalia*, N. S., 28 (1959), 170-185.

² *L'Évangile de Vérité* (Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1962).

continuum of truth in the Bible? Is there a *continuum* of truth which carries over into the works of the early Fathers? How do Justin and the writer of *Ev. Ver.* reflect and/or modify such a *continuum*? These are the basic questions addressed in the final chapter.

CHAPTER ONE

AN ANALYSIS OF *EVANGELIUM VERITATIS*

I. THE PROLOGUE (16:31-17:9)

Ev. Ver. is a meditation or homily on the gospel, the gospel as the author understands it. The prologue gives an introduction to the main emphases of this document. The prologue is *Ev. Ver.* in miniature.

1. The gospel originates with the Father; it is not self-generated. What the writer means is that without the Father of truth there can be no gospel of truth. In fact, the gospel has to do primarily with the Father, the problem being that the Father is uncontainable and unknowable. He is able, however, to reveal himself in the Word, the Savior. The language of the prologue at this point clearly reflects the background of the New Testament revelation in Christ. The Father of truth comes to men, which means that the Word who was in the Father's thought makes his entrance from above. The ambiguity of *Ev. Ver.* is evident. There is no mention of time, space, or place, whereby the one who came forth from the Father is related to this world. The interest of *Ev. Ver.* lies in a metaphysical world.

2. The gospel concerns those who are without gnosis of the Father. Its concern is cosmic in scope for, "The All... came forth from him" (17:5-6), though they do not know the Father. Nevertheless the gospel of truth elicits a joyous response from those who have received grace to know him (16:32-33). The past "history" of these elect, their present predicament, and potential destiny, all come under the purview of the writer who, however, fails to nail down these epochs in man's life to time and place. Thus those who were without gnosis and who respond to the gospel of truth comprise the All. They were once in the Father, then departed, but now pursue the goal toward their pristine existence.

3. The gospel is a gospel of hope. Its movement is always forward or upward to the *pleroma* (16:35) from which the Savior came. The gnosis which men receive marks the beginning of their existence. But, since the *pleroma* or completeness lies with the Father,

it is necessary (ΑΝΑΓΚΗ) that the All ascend up to the Father to receive it (cf. 21:8-11).

In brief, what the prologue presents in broad outline and what the text of *Ev. Ver.* will develop in detail are that the gospel of truth originates with the Father of truth, centers in the revelation of a unique gnosis of the Father in the Word who is also the Savior, and concerns men who are without gnosis molding them into an elect community and supplying them with the hope or goal of a life in the Father.

II. ERROR AND FORGETTING AND HOW THEY ARE OVERCOME (17:9-18:15)

The writer now begins to fill in the broad lines of emphasis presented in the prologue. The prologue states that men are without gnosis since they departed from their place in the Father. How this departure happened is the concern of the writer beginning with the last word of 17:9-10, ΕΤΑΝΤΑΤΕΝΟΤΩΝ, "As for the not-knowing (the Father)." This alpha privative noun is related to its verbal form in 16:39-17:1. Man without gnosis descends into the mental state of fear and frustration. Separated from the Father he comes under the control of evil powers (=ΠΛΑΗΗ or Error) in a material world of beauty, a counterfeit of God's truth (17:19-21). There he is made to forget (cf. the causative form ἔβωε in 17:24, 36; 18:8) his high origin in the Father and reduced to a slave of Error (17:34-36). At this critical juncture in his dilemma, through the mercies of the Father the gospel comes to man bringing to him the gnosis of the Father which nullifies the work of Forgetting (18:5-15).

III. ERROR PURSUES JESUS TO THE TREE (= THE CROSS), BUT THE FRUIT OF THAT TREE GIVES BELIEVERS A GNOSIS THAT IS AN EARNST OF THEIR COMPLETENESS IN THE FATHER WHICH THEY RECEIVE WHEN THEY ASCEND TO HIM (18:15-19:17)

Accepting W. Till's punctuation,¹ this section begins with the sentence, "It is through Jesus the Christ that this hidden mystery dawned upon those who were in darkness by virtue of the work of Forgetting. It [i.e. the Gospel] dawned upon them. It provided a way, and this way is (the) Truth of which it informed them"

¹ "Das Evangelium der Wahrheit," *ZNTW*, 50 (1959), 170.

(18:15-21). The above translation understands "the gospel" as the subject of the main verbs which have the auxiliaries of the third masculine singular. The verbs and objects are important. They are, "to produce light," "to provide a way," and "to proclaim truth." All this is possible, according to the writer, through the person of Jesus the Christ.

At this point, Error, which formerly was at work to imprison man in a mere material existence, begins to oppress Jesus and bring him to ruin through crucifixion (18:21-24). The section vividly portrays the encounter of the gospel of Truth with Error. Strangely enough, while the gospel centers in its agent, Jesus the Christ through whom the message of the gospel comes, there is no mention of any agent(s) through whom Error works. A similar indefiniteness was seen in 17:9-18:14, where the work of Error was operative not primarily in a "temporal or spatial creation" but in the total involvement of man in a material existence. Here also, there is a disregard for definite persons and places where Error works. The entire opposition to Christ and the gospel is expressed by the writer in **πλῆν**. The writer's philosophy can by-pass the earthly, the temporal, and the personal. He describes the opposition to Jesus and the gospel in one great concept—Error. The one bare allusion to the earthly and the temporal in the clause, "He was nailed to a tree," soon dispels as the writer is caught up with a description of the fruit of the tree and the results that occur as one partakes of it (18:24 ff.). In 18:24-25, the subject of **ἀφῴωνε** is "the tree" (= the cross) and not "Jesus." That is, the tree bore as its fruit the gnosis of the Father. In 18:26-29, Grobel sees an allusion to Gen. 2:9 and 3:3,¹ thereby understanding the verb **ἠταψτεκο** as transitive, "it has not destroyed." But Till² is probably more correct here in interpreting **ἠταψτεκο** (18:26) as intransitive. Thus, understanding **ὄνταρ** "fruit" as the subject of both **ἠταψτεκο** (18:26) and **ἀψ†** (18:28), the translation becomes, "Moreover it [i.e. the fruit] did not perish because they ate it, but on the contrary it [i.e. the fruit ³] granted to those who ate

¹ K. Grobel, *The Gospel of Truth*, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960), p. 53.

² "Bemerkungen zur Erstausgabe des *Evangelium veritatis*," *Orientalia*, N. S., 27 (1958), 272.

³ W. Till, *ZNTW*, 50 (1959), 170, believes that the third masculine singular auxiliary **ἀψ†** in **ἀψ†** (18:28) refers to the Father. He interprets the clause to mean, "verlieh der Vater die Gnade."

it to experience joy [lit. "to become a joy"] in this discovery" (18:26-29). The discovery (πισινη) is the fruit of the gospel (= gnosis) that comes through the cross, the discovery to which the prologue has already referred (17:3-4). This discovery is further described by the use of the verb σινη. "They were found in him and he indeed was found in them, he, the infinite, incomprehensible Father who is perfect" (18:29-33).

With the mention of the verb "is complete" (qual.), an eschatological emphasis begins which continues on through the beginning of 19:17. Gnosis is the fruit of the cross but it is at the same time only an earnest of the fullness of the perfect life in the Father. Pl. 19:6-7 describes succinctly this eschatological goal in the clause οὐσαυτη οὐρει ρ̅η̅ο̅υ̅ζ̅ο̅κ, "a gnosis unique in completeness." The implication is that a gnosis without completeness falls short of the Divine goal. In *Ev. Ver.*, gnosis is primarily subjective, that is, gnosis of the Father means basically gnosis of oneself. Completeness, however, is objective; it seems frequently to connote a meaningful relationship with the Father.

IV. THE COMING OF JESUS, THE BOOK OF THE LIVING ONES, AND THE DIVINE CALL (19:17-22:20)

The three themes noted in the title of the section stand inter-related in the passage. Jesus' coming and the word he speaks become the occasion for the manifestation of the book of the living ones who, in turn, are the ones who hear the Divine call and rise up to him who calls them in order to possess the things that are theirs.

The section begins abruptly, "He became a Guide, peaceable and persevering." It is clear from the following context that the Guide is Jesus. He appears in a school where he speaks the "word" (πυρεε, 19:20). The mention of Jesus as teacher (σαρ, 19:20) is of interest from the standpoint of the New Testament. The expression "school" (lit. "the place for receiving instruction") may mean synagogue. The message of Jesus is not given but two very clear results of his teaching are noted. First, men come to him (ει υπαρει "approach" in 19:21, 28). This is clearly the situation in the New Testament gospels (cf. e.g. Mark 1:45). Second, the teaching of Jesus meets with a two-fold response; the wise reject it while the little ones receive it (19:21 ff.), a fact which, no less than the first, recalls the gospel situation and the

decision which the message of Jesus inevitably elicited from his hearers. By the "wise" (σοφός, 19:21), the writer probably means the Jews. That they are wise "in their own minds alone" indicates that they are not so before God. The Greek word *εμπυρε* in 19:23 reflects passages such as Matt. 16:1; 19:3 *et al.* Jesus' reproof of the wise as being empty may be compared to his denunciation of the Pharisees according to Matt. 23. After the wise come the little ones who receive Jesus' teaching. It is possible that there is a reflection at this point of some kind of historical sequence—from Jews to Gentiles—but the language is not clear. What does seem clear is the reference to the gospels (e.g. Matt. 11:25; 18:2-6 *et al.*) through the term "little ones also" (ἡρεκονι ὑηλ, 19:28-29), though no rebirth is present in *Ev. Ver.* The clause, "theirs is the gnosis of the Father" (19:29 f.) may be, as Grobel with some hesitation suggests, "a Gnostic transmutation of Matt. 5:8."¹

The writer next states the results of the acceptance of Jesus' word. (a) They become strong. (b) They enter a life of communion with the Father. (c) They become the manifestation of the living book of the living ones; they are the living ones (19:34 ff.). Here is found one of the most important parts of the section. Grobel says, "This is the book of life of Ps. 69:28; Phil. 4:3, and Rev. 3:5, but singularly enriched: no longer merely the *record* of the names of the saved but the vehicle of salvation inasmuch as it is the good news, the saving message."² It is doubtful, however, whether this is the sense of the passage before us. The question is, does the book mean "a vehicle of salvation" or "the saved ones" themselves? The latter apparently gives more of the sense of the passage. The book is a book of the living ones who are written in the thought and mind (νοῦς) of the Father (19:35-20:1). The restoration of [ἡτεπ]ιωτ at the beginning of 20:1 is quite certain since the language is parallel to what the prologue says about the Word (= Jesus) "who is in the thought and mind of the Father" (16:35-36). The Biblical parallel to which *Ev. Ver.* is far more closely related than the passages to which the notes of the *Ev. Ver.* appeal³ (or Grobel) is 2 Cor. 3:2-3a, "You yourselves are our letter of

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 59.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Evangelium Veritatis*, ed. by Michel Malinine, Henri-Charles Puech, and Gilles Quispel (Zurich: Rascher Verlag, 1956), p. 53.

recommendation, written on your hearts, to be known and read by all men; and you show that you are a letter from Christ" (RSV). The letter of which Paul speaks is really the believing community at Corinth. The book to which the writer of *Ev. Ver.* refers is apparently also a community of believers.

The open manifestation of the book was dependent on the sacrificial death of Jesus (20:3-38). Here is one of the most intriguing passages in the document.¹ It is replete with references to the Bible, especially to Revelation and Hebrews. The writer is certain that Jesus is indispensable. To take the book, Jesus must suffer, and, to give life to many, he must die (20:10-14). The clause, "since he knows that that death of his is life for many" (20:13-14) is remarkable for its sacrificial emphasis and its proximity in thought to Mark 10:45. The passage contains the one possible reference in *Ev. Ver.* to the "resurrection" of Jesus (20:30-34). Jesus divests himself of the "rags of corruption" and clothes himself with eternal life (20:30-32). The reference apparently means that Jesus divested himself of material flesh and assumed "resurrection" life. In his resurrection state Jesus comes to those who are naked by reason of the work of Forgetting. Since Jesus is gnosis and completeness he proclaims those things which are in the Father's heart (20:36-21:1).

Several benefits are said to accrue to those who respond:

1. They receive instruction (21:3-6).
2. They receive themselves from the Father (21:6-7). This apparently means that the Father gives themselves to them. This strange concept has a clear parallel in 25:11-12, **ερεπνορεει πορεει ναχι πλάγ**. The parallel supports the reading suggested above for 21:6-7. Pl. 21:11-14, 19-22, makes a similar emphasis. Acquisition of gnosis means that one takes the things that are his and draws them to himself. At first sight, the idea is quite far removed from the opening lines of the prologue where the thing received (α) is grace to know one who comes from without, i.e. from the *pleroma* (16:32 ff.). Gnosis, however, means that one acquires knowledge of two persons—God and one's true self. "He who by the good news is made Gnostic receives two things, God and his own lost or 'forgotten' self. Knowledge of God and of one's true self are two sides of the same thing; one cannot have

¹ Chap. III, propos. III discusses this passage in detail.

either without the other.”¹ Thus, to receive oneself and to take the things that belong to oneself mean essentially the same thing.

3. They turn themselves to the Father another time (21:7-8). This indicates that at one time they were turned toward him, the very thing which the prologue states.

4. They ascend to the Father and receive completeness (21:8-23).

5. They hear the Divine call (21:23-22:19).

a. The call is rooted in the Divine purpose (21:23-27). The text reads, “He enrolled them beforehand for he prepared them to give to those who had gone forth from him, [i.e.] those whom he foreknew, their name.” This translation understands the form $\alpha\tau\epsilon\epsilon\iota$ as an infinitive form of τ with the preposition α (= ϵ) as preformative.² This infinitive (21:24) then takes as its direct object $\alpha\pi\omicron\rho\upsilon\rho\epsilon\eta$ “their name” (21:26-27). The two clauses in between the infinitive and the direct object are indirect objects, “those who came forth from him,” and “those whom he foreknew.”

b. The call comes at the end (21:27), an end which has apparently already begun. Some kind of future *eschaton*, however, is suggested by 21:35, “until the end.”

c. The call brings assurance (21:28-30) since one knows that the Father has called his name. The call, an effectual call, precedes the gnosis of the call. Nevertheless the call and gnosis go together. The writer means that the call creates the name. Thus since name implies existence, no true existence is possible apart from Divine initiative (cf. 39:11-12).

d. The lack of a call implies that one is a-gnostic, in the grip of Forgetting, despised, and basically deaf to the call (21:30-22:2). The phrase $\omega\alpha \tau\theta\alpha\eta$ (21:35) reveals an element of hope in a section that otherwise shows a strong predetermination. The clause, “he shall perish” (21:36-37) does not necessarily imply suffering. The compound verb $\delta\omega\lambda \alpha\delta\alpha\lambda$ (21:37) has a wide variety of meanings such as, “dissolve, terminate, go to pieces, die, be loose, nullify, absolve,” etc. (cf. *Crum*, pp. 32 f.). Perhaps the idea of “to pass away and be no more” gives the true sense here.

6. Characteristics of the one who is called (22:3-19).

a. He has gnosis (22:3).

b. His origin is from above (22:3-4). More precisely, “He is a-forth-one from on high.” The expression is made up of the

¹ K. Grobel, *op. cit.*, p. 71, note 129.

² Cf. Till, *Orientalia*, N. S., 27 (1958), 274

indefinite article **οτ** prefixed to the adverb **αβαλ**. A similar construction with the definite article is found in the A_2 version of John 8:23, **ΑΝΑΚ' ΑΝΑΚ' [οτ]ΑΒΑΛ ρΗΤΠΕ**¹ and in the Sahidic version of 1 Cor. 2:12 **ΑΛΛΑ ΠΕΝΗΑ ΠΕΒΟΛ ΑΠΗΟΥΤΕ**, "but the Spirit, the Forth-One of God."

c. He answers the call (22:4-7).

d. He rises to the one who calls him (22:7-9). The conjunctive **ΠΥΨΕ** carries on the sense of the *praesens consuetudinis* which is found three times in 22:5-6. The "ascent of the soul" is not necessarily eschatological, for by the same sequence in this section the writer seems to mean that the ascent occurs when one accepts the Divine call. He rises mystically into a new sphere of existence—in gnosis—where he understands how he was called.

e. He performs the Divine will and receives rest and a name (22:9-13). Once again the use of the *praesens consuetudinis* shows the normal response and life of the gnostic.

f. He understands his origin and destiny (22:13-20).

V. THE GNOSIS OF THE LIVING BOOK (22:20-25:25)

In brief, this section concerns a gnosis of Jesus and his work in behalf of those who are chosen (22:20-23:2). They are the Father's perfect book (23:2-18), while Jesus is the Father's Word (23:18-33) who performs the Father's work among the elect (23:33-24:6), and brings them to the place of the perfect Unity in the Father (24:6-25:25).

1. A gnosis of Jesus and his work avails for those who are chosen (22:20-23:2). The section begins abruptly. The subject of **ΑΥΣΤΟ ΠΡΑΘ ΑΒΑΛ ρΗ ΤΕΠΛΑΝΗ**, "He has turned back many from Error" is Jesus. A similar abrupt beginning was observed in 19:17. The statement furnishes the third main fact concerning **ΠΛΑΝΗ** in *Ev. Ver.* Error imprisoned man in a mere material existence (17:9 ff.), oppressed Jesus and brought him to the cross (18:21-24), and now is defeated by Jesus who rescues many from Error's grip (22:20-21). The following sentence pictures the ascension of Jesus into the spaces (**ΨΑΝΙΛΑΕΙΤ**), the sphere which the chosen ones left when they took Error into their hearts (22:21-24). The reason why the chosen are said to have left the Father is because of the depth (**ΠΙΒΑΘΟΣ**) of the one, i.e. the Father,

¹ *The Gospel of St. John according to the earliest Coptic manuscript* (British School of Archaeology in Egypt, 1924, Vol. 36), p. 15a.

who surrounds¹ all space without himself being surrounded (22:25-27). The idea brings to mind the error of Sophia prominent in the Valentinian speculation as described by Irenaeus.² Sophia, the twelfth aeon becomes absorbed in her agonizing search after the Father.

"She was continually desiring, as they affirm, to comprehend his greatness; since (she) was unable because of her application to an impossible affair and altogether coming to be in much travail, and because of the greatness of the depth [τὸ βάθος] and [because of] the unsearchability of the Father . . ." ³

There are, however, sharp differences between *Ev. Ver.* and the description of Irenaeus. Irenaeus' account deals with a pre-cosmological *pleroma* of thirty aeons: *Ev. Ver.* is concerned with chosen human beings whose origin and destiny are in the Father though their lot is cast in a material world. To the writer of *Ev. Ver.* it is an amazing thing (ἄλλοις) that these beings were in (imperf. ἦν) the Father though ignorant of him (22:28-29) and yet able to go out of him (22:29-30). These three assertions, i.e. in the Father, not knowing the Father, and able to go forth from the Father, are followed by two explanatory arguments (one negative, one positive), both introduced by the Greek conjunction ὅτι. First, the situation is as it is because the Father's will had not yet been revealed (22:33-35). Second, his will did become manifest in Jesus Christ (22:35-23:2).

2. The chosen ones are the Father's perfect or complete book (23:3-18). The subject of the copula ἔστιν in 23:3 is apparently "his chosen ones" or the "All." Since the book is a living book (22:39) of those who live (cf. 19:35-36), quite naturally the writer proceeds to describe it negatively and positively. The book does not constitute a group of vowels and consonants, i.e. a pen-and-ink book (23:3-7), but it is like a perfect book which the Father has written in order that the aeons might know him (23:8-18). In 23:3, authorities generally agree that τῷπῳ "mark" should be read

¹ For the translation "who surrounds all space," the text has the perfect tense, i.e. "who has surrounded all space." Till, *Orientalia*, N.S., 27 (1958), 275, observes that the verb ΚΤΑΕΙΤ is qualitative, and thus, it cannot be construed with *either* the perfect or the future. Till emends the text, therefore from ἄπὸ ΚΤΑΕΙΤ to ἄπὸ ΚΤΑΕΙΤ (i.e. omit the first Α).

² *Adv. H.*, I. 2: 3.

³ A translation of the Greek text of Irenaeus as found in W.W. Harvey, *Sancti Irenaei*, I, 15.

instead of **τοπος** "place." The sense of 23:5 is that the living ones who make up the Father's book have no sound since sound marks out the pronunciation of vowels and consonants in an ordinary book. The living ones can be pronounced only as they are recognized as consonants of truth (23:8-10). This must mean some kind of philosophical or mystical recognition of the true nature of the living ones.¹

3. Jesus is the Father's Word (23:18-33). Grobel has placed the Coptic text of this section into "sense lines" by regularizing the recurring **ⲡⲧⲟⲟⲩ** and the pattern as a whole, i.e. "Noun + **ⲡⲧⲟⲟⲩ** + Verb + a single word."² The single exception, as Grobel observes, to this pattern is found in 23:23-24 where the periphrastic construction requires two words. Some exception should be taken to Grobel's treatment. First, he believes that the close of the preceding section (i.e. 23:17-18) "sets the exact pattern for the ten clauses that follow."³ How exact is the pattern? The noun and verb in 23:17-18 are plural whereas all of the ten nouns and verbs that are contained in the pattern are singular. Also, the ten nouns (23:18-33) depict what may be termed personal attributes or characteristics of the Father in relation to the Word (= his Son), while 23:17-18 refers to the living ones who are written by the Father. Furthermore, whereas the ten verbs are singular having in the background as subject, the Father (i.e. "his wisdom," "his teaching," etc.), the verb in 23:18 is plural and has for its subject the aeons. Second, Grobel refers the suffix of **ⲡⲧⲟⲟⲩ** (23:17) to "the book," whereas the preceding context makes it more logical to refer the suffix to "the Father." Third, against

¹ An important textual problem appears in the sentence **ⲉⲟⲩⲙⲉ ⲉϣⲁⲛⲕⲏ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲉⲣⲉⲓ ⲡⲉⲣⲉⲓ** (23:11-12). The form **ⲙⲉ** is the typical Sahidic word for "truth," but since *Ev. Ver.* is written in the Subakhmimic dialect, one would expect to find the form **ⲙⲏⲉ**, as elsewhere in *Ev. Ver.* (cf. 16:31, 33; 26:30-31; 32:35; 36:12; 42:25-26). In addition to these occurrences of **ⲙⲏⲉ**, *Ev. Ver.* reveals the noun form **ⲙⲏⲧⲙⲏⲉ**, the adverbial forms **ⲛⲁⲙⲏⲉ** and **ⲙⲁⲙⲏⲉ**. In all the occurrences of these forms, however, the basic stem is **ⲙⲏⲉ**, not **ⲙⲉ**. It is for this reason that Till suggests that the reading **ⲉⲟⲩⲙⲉ** in 23:11 is an abbreviation for **ⲉⲟⲩⲙⲉⲣⲉ** "a thought," and thus he renders the sentence, "because each letter is a complete thought" (*ein vollkommener Gedanke*). The significance of this translation will appear in chap. III, propos. II. Till's discussion is found in *Orientalia*, N.S., 27 (1958), 275.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 87.

³ *Ibid.*

Grobel, the object of the verbs in the hymn is the Word (= Jesus). The last two strophes of the hymn appear to be quite decisive in this respect.

The first of the ten strophes describes Jesus as the Word (**ⲁⲡⲓⲱⲉⲗⲉ**, 23:19-20) which recalls 16:34. Logically the third masc. sing. suffix found as the object of each verb in each of the nine following strophes refers to the Word. The apparent absence of a suffix in the third strophe is explained at the proper place below. It is within the context of the passage (23:18-33) that the Word walks forth among the All, takes the form of the face of the All, and brings the All back to the Father (23:33 ff.). The connection of this section with the preceding portion (23:3-18) is that the chosen ones are the Father's mystical book only by means of the Father's gnosis and Word which Jesus represents. Following is a consideration of the ten strophes in this "hymn" on Jesus, the Father's Word.

(1) "As for his wisdom, it meditates on the Word" (23:18-20). The verb **ⲡⲙⲉⲗⲉⲧⲁ** is taken over from Greek though its usual reproduction in Coptic is by the infinitive, **ⲡⲙⲉⲗⲉⲧⲁⲛ**.¹ The writer surely means that the Father's interest centers in the Word (= his Son).

(2) "While his doctrine speaks of him." This is the outward expression of the inner meditation on the Logos.

(3) "His gnosis has revealed (him)." Till has observed that **ⲁⲱⲟⲩⲁⲛⲉ̅̅̅ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ** stands in the text for **ⲁⲱⲟⲩⲁⲛⲉ̅̅̅ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ**, i.e. "has manifested him."² The connection between the Father's gnosis and the revelation of his Son is established in 30:23-26.

(4) "His forbearance [i.e. the Father's] is a crown upon him." This translation (cf. also Till's rendering *Nachsicht*³) is uncertain.

¹ The form **ⲙⲉⲗⲉⲧⲁ** (without the **ⲛ** of the inf.) does occur, however, in Psa. 168 of the Manichaean Psalmbook, also in connection with **ⲥⲟⲩⲣⲓⲁ** (cf. Allberry, *The Manichaean Psalmbook*, II, 86 line 23). Allberry's translation is, "I have constantly practised . . . in thy holy wisdom" (cf. also the form **ⲙⲉⲗⲉⲧⲛ** in Allberry, *ibid.*, p. 116, lines 14-15). The non-infinitival form is found also in Polotsky, *Manichäische Homilien*, p. 23, lls. 1-2, also occurring with **ⲥⲟⲩⲣⲓⲁ**, i.e. [**ⲛ**] **ⲥⲙⲉⲗⲉⲧⲁ ⲟⲩⲛⲛⲁⲙⲉ ⲛⲧⲥⲟⲩⲣⲓⲁ** "and meditated in the books of wisdom" (*und in den Büchern der Weisheit lesen*).

² Till, *Orientalia*, N.S., 27 (1958), 275, 273.

³ *ZNTW*, 50 (1959), 173. H.-M. Schenke, *op. cit.*, p. 40, renders the word *Schutz*, "defence, shelter," but gives no explanation of his rendering.

If correct, the meaning would be that the Father's forbearance is manifest to all in his Son.

(5) "His joy is joined to him." The opening sentence of *Ev. Ver.* describes the gospel as a joy. The writer sees this joy as linked to Jesus.

(6) "His glory has exalted him." Comparison may be made to the hymn of Phil. 2. The exaltation of Jesus is to the glory of God the Father (v. 11). Cf. also John 17: 1-5.

(7) "His form (сѡмѡт) revealed him." The translation is awkward but it continues the pattern of the hymn as set by the first strophe. To express this in another way, Jesus is the revelation of the Father's likeness (cf. John 14:8; Phil. 2:6).

(8) "His rest [contentment, pleasure] appropriated him," (lit. "took him to himself"). This may be compared to Mark 1:11 and John 8:29.

(9) "His love put a body (сѡмѡдѡ) about him." Grobel admits that some kind of incarnation is present in the expression, but since he fails to find reference to Christ in this hymn, he thinks the incarnate body to be the church.¹ This strophe continues, however, the emphasis upon Jesus, the Father's Word. It is the incarnation of the Word (cf. John 1:1, 14) which is a manifestation of the Father's *agape* (cf. John 3:16).

(10) "His trust embraced him." The meaning is apparently the complete confidence which the Father had in the Son (cf., e.g. John 5:20 ff., especially, v. 22).

4. Jesus (= the Logos) performs a work among the chosen ones (= the All)—23:33-24:6. As indicated above (cf. the introduction to the hymn), the hymn portrays the complete satisfaction of the Father in his Logos. This new section describes the work of the Logos. A translation of 23:33-24:6 is important for the discussion.

"Thus the Word of the Father walks forth among the All, because he is the fruit of his [the Father's] heart and a manifestation of the presence of his will. But he [the Word] supports the All while he chooses them. And moreover [ѡн=он] he takes the manifestation of the presence of the All (and) purifies them."

The incarnate Word (23:30-31) is at work among the All. The verb *сѣмѡдѡе* is the second present A₂ form of *сѡдѡѣ* (cf. the

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 89, 91.

Arabic verb مشي "to walk") and perhaps reflects the mention in the Fourth Gospel of the walk of Jesus (cf. John 1:36; 6:66; 7:1; 10:23). The words **εποΰταρ [ητε] . . . πε**, "because he is the fruit of his heart" recall 18:24-26 where the crucified Jesus (or the "tree") produced the fruit of the knowledge of the Father. By the phrase, "a manifestation of the presence of his will" (cf. 19:30-32; 24:5), the writer seems to say that the will of God is seen in Jesus (cf. John 6:38; 4:34; 5:30; Matt. 26:39, 42). The present tenses of this passage take us beyond the historical manifestation of Jesus which the writer certainly admits (cf. 19:17 ff.), and emphasize a continuous work that he performs. The Christian counterpart of this is the presence of the living Christ in his church. The purification of the All (24:4-6) prepares them for their destiny.

5. Jesus brings the All to the place of perfect Unity in the Father (24:6-25:25).

a. The revelation of the Father aims to give rest (24:6-21). That Jesus brings men back to the Father (24: 6-7) is a recurring emphasis in *Ev. Ver.* The additional phrase **αδουη α†μερ** "unto the mother" (24:7) is puzzling. Perhaps the word designates the Father from the viewpoint of his power of reproduction or generation. Or, is it a reflection of the feminine *ἐννοια*, counterpart to the male principle *προπάτωρ*, the two comprising the original syzygy in the Valentinian *pleroma*? ¹

The sentence which begins with the second word of 24:9 continues on through the word **απϋϋτα** in 24:21 and includes a long parenthesis of two sentences. This sentence may be rendered as follows:

"The Father reveals his breast, (now his breast is the Holy Spirit who reveals this hidden one of his: this hidden one of his is his Son) in order that through the compassions of the Father, the Aeons might know him and cease striving, as they seek after the Father, as they rest themselves there in him, knowing that this is the Rest which has filled up the Lack."

The main part of the purpose clause beginning with **ϋϋνα** in 24:14, concludes with **ηδαιωη** in 24:17. To this purpose clause, however, three subordinate clauses are joined which continue through the word **απϋϋτα** in 24:21. The ceaseless striving and seeking after the Father reflects not only the prologue (17:4 ff.), but comprises one of the important recurring themes in *Ev. Ver.*

¹ *Adv. H.*, I:1.

Restlessness, disturbance, weariness—these are all the work of Error in the world. All of these disturbing elements, says *Ev. Ver.*, are overcome as men return to the Father and “rest themselves there in him” (24:18-19).¹

b. The Father abolishes Lack and gives Completeness (24:21-25:7). The Lack or a-gnostic condition has its own form (ϸϫΗΛΛ) of expression in the cosmos (πρὸς.κοσ in 24:23). This is the only place in *Ev. Ver.* where the Greek word κόσμος appears, and, significantly enough, it occurs in connection with Jesus’ service in the world (πρεσβυτερος ἡρῶν, 24:23-24). It is true that in the immediate context Jesus is not mentioned. It can be remembered, however, that the very object of the revelation with which the long purpose clause (24:9-21) is concerned, is the Son (24:15). This fact makes the absence of the name of Jesus understandable. Significantly, the cosmos is said to be the appearance or form ϸϫΗΛΛ of the Lack (= the a-gnostic state). With the Father, however, there is completeness (24:25-28). When men do not have gnosis of the Father, the Lack exists. But when the Father is known, the Lack ceases to exist from that very hour (24:28-32).

Beginning with the end of 24:32 and continuing through 25:6, the writer introduces two parables² concluding with a summary statement on the disappearance of Form (ϸϫΗΛΛ). If the Lack disappears (25:2), then its Form, the cosmos, likewise ceases to exist. This is all due to (ἡρῶν[ῖ] ὁπ as in 25:2-3, 10, 12) the harmony (πῶς) of Unity (= the Father). Apparently “the harmony of Unity” refers to the union with the Father in true gnosis which the chosen ones come to experience.

c. Through Unity, the All will overcome matter and attain to themselves and to a new existence free from the ϣῶλη (25:7-19). In 25:8-10, the writer seems to mean that there is a part which the present cosmos has to play, but it is temporary. It will pass away when the Father will complete the spaces (= modes of existence). Three things are said to happen to the Gnostics (25:10-19). First, they receive themselves (25:10-12, cf. the discussion on this concept in 21:6-7). Second, they are separated out of diversity (*Crum*, 367a) into Unity. It appears that the oneness

¹ The double ΛΛΔ in 24:18-19 is explained by Grobel, *op. cit.*, p. 95, note 215, as the reflex. pron. followed by the adverb (Sah.) “there.”

² For an exegetical treatment of the parables of *Ev. Ver.*, see chap. III, propos. II.

of God has been lost in the bewildering diversity of the cosmos. The writer expresses a kind of eschatological goal. The original oneness must be recovered. Third, they consume the *hulic* nature within themselves. Only light and life remain. No asceticism is present in *Ev. Ver.* On the other hand the writer implicitly recognizes a *hulic* sphere of existence to be banished in the future.

d. The Need to Meditate on these Facts (25:19-25). The object of meditation is not stated, though it is probably the destiny of the Gnostics (cf. the context).

VI. THE COMING OF JESUS MEANS JUDGMENT (25:25-27:9)

The emphasis of this section falls on the judgment of two classes of people in the world, depicted as two types of vessel. The bad vessels are removed while the good are purified and filled. The judgment is Divine, i.e. "from above." Error is defeated while Truth (= the Father's mouth) is embraced. Such a judgment, according to the writer, can only be the manifestation of the Father.

The "master of the house" is the Father, and the "house," the world. This means that the parable is quite bold. The world *does* belong to the Father and contains two classes of men—the a-gnostic and the gnostic. The a-gnostic men are removed in judgment, while the Gnostics remain and are a source of joy to the Father. Pl. 25:35-26:1 declares plainly that this is the judgment (τερπικε) that has come forth from above. Pl. 26:1-4 reads, "Because it [i.e. the judgment] is a drawn sword of two edges, cutting this way and that. It has judged [lit. "given judgment"] each one" (cf. the Sah. of Matt. 7:2). The language used by the writer is close to that found in Hebr. 4:12; Rev. 2:12, 16; 19:15 as the textual notes of *Ev. Ver.* mention.¹ One may also compare the sword of judgment of Ezek. 21:3-5 and 1 Chron. 21:16. In one sense, the judgment in *Ev. Ver.* has already begun (cf. 26:4 ff.). The instrument of judgment is the Logos (cf. John 5:22; Acts 10:42; 17:31). The writer continues with mystical language by affirming that the Logos is "in the heart of those who pronounce it" (26:5-6). In addition, however, he states that the Logos is more than a sound that can be pronounced; it became a body (αἰψὸς ὄρωμα, 26:8). It can hardly be questioned that the writer refers to the incarnation.

¹ P. 56.

The result of the appearance of the Logos follows in 26:8 ff. The parable of the vessels (ἡσκευος) is resumed (cf. 25:25 ff.) with a similar two-fold classification of the vessels (26:8-18). The Logos causes a great stir among the vessels. The verbs which are used to describe this event form themselves into three opposite pairs:

emptied	—	filled
poured out	—	provided for
broken	—	purified

There are thus three predicates ascribed to each of the two types of vessels, the description of each type proceeding from result back to immediate cause. That is, the one type represents vessels that have become emptied because they have been poured out due to the fact that they were broken. The other type represents vessels that have become filled because they were provided for after they were first purified. The net result, however, is clear in the first pair of the three predicates—the empty ones stand in opposition to the full. Till insists that some event (*Vorgang*) is designated by the perfect tenses that are used in this section and that this fact must be kept in mind in any translation.¹ Such is the writer's description of Divine judgment.

The writer continues by describing the effects of judgment on **πλανη**, the basic Force working in the cosmos (26:18-27). Apparently with purpose, the author sets forth the **†** "offspring" of Truth (26:28-29) in contrast to the offspring of Error or **πλανη** (26:25-26). The offspring of Truth (= the Gnostics) are said to recognize Truth (26:28-29) and thus, to embrace the Father in truth (26:30-31), while a complete (perfect) power joins them to the Father (26:31-32). In general, the writer adds that everyone who loves the truth will receive the Holy Spirit and be united to the Father.

By way of summary, it can be said that this entire section connects Divine judgment with the appearance of Jesus. It is precisely when he takes a body (σωμα) that a decisive division among men appears. His coming in judgment is described also as the coming of gnosis and Truth. Judgment is a two-edged sword. All men are like so many vessels before the Father. Some are to be carried away in judgment because they are empty (i.e. offspring

¹ *Orientalia*, N. S., 27 (1958), 276.

of Error), while others become a source of joy to the Father because they are full (i.e. offspring of Truth).

VII. THE FATHER GIVES TO HIS ELECT,
FORM, NAME, AND EXISTENCE (27:9-33)

Name-giving is the Divine prerogative in *Ev. Ver.* as in the Bible. This section reveals Hebraic thought where the name signifies what the person is (cf. Isa. 9:5-6).

VIII. THE FATHER'S WILL AND MAN'S BEING AND BECOMING
(27:34-28:31)

The distinction between the infinitive form of the verb $\gamma\omega\mu\epsilon$ "to become" and its qualitative form $\gamma\omega\sigma\tau\iota$ "to exist," is important for the interpretation of this section. At the close of the preceding passage the writer insisted that at one time the Gnostics had not yet come into existence and, hence, did not know the Father. Does this mean that they were essentially non-entities? Not at all, says the writer, for not only is their being ($\sigma\epsilon\gamma\omega\sigma\tau\iota$, 27:36) in the Father (28:1) but their becoming ($\alpha\tau\rho\sigma\gamma\omega\mu\epsilon$, 28:2) depends on the Father's will—if he wills it and when he wills it (28:1-3). The Divine will is decisive. That their *being* refers to some kind of non-visible life and their *becoming* to some kind of visible manifestation, is a reasonable conclusion from the parable that follows (28:3-5). It reads, "Just as the opportune time [$\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omicron\varsigma$] which is about to come, [so, in this case, the opportune moment is about to come, that is] all things have not yet become manifest." Things are not revealed now but when the opportune time arrives, they will become clear.

Beginning with 28:18 and continuing through 28:31, the writer contrasts the inner thoughts of those who think by themselves (28:19) and those who think what the Father desires (28:24-25). This is an intriguing psychological exposition. The first speaker makes his boast of *becoming*, i.e. "I have come to be, [I do not fear]" (28:20). The Coptic text of this second statement of the confession is not certain. The translation is only an attempt to fill in the damaged line. Although he confesses his *becoming*, he has no *being* and thus, will never *become* (28:22-24). In contrast, 28:26 ff. presents the confession which the Father desires a man to make. It is striking to observe that the confession of this second speaker begins like that of the first, i.e. "I have become." In this case,

however, the statement contains an unnerving predicate, i.e. "I have become as the shadows and phantoms of the night." He means that, "as the shades and fantasies do not really exist, neither did I."¹ Thus, the one without root claims that he has come into existence, whereas the one who thinks the Father's thoughts confesses that his becoming is found only in the realms of unreality. This is apparently the Gnostic counterpart to the Christian confession of sin and guilt (cf. the tax collector in Luke 18:13, "be merciful to me *the* sinner"). The Gnostic confession, however, is void of any sense of guilt and of any responsibility for the unreality which has become his sphere of existence. It has only one thing in common with the confession of the tax collector—the confession of need. The Gnostic confesses that he has become involved in an unreal existence. And yet, the writer says, his very confession means that the Divine light has dawned revealing the unreality of his existence (28:28-31).

IX. THE PARABLE OF THE NIGHTMARE AND ITS MEANING

(28:32-30:14)

This section is an expansion on the previous one. In 28:26 ff., the Gnostic confession was seen to touch briefly upon his phantom-like existence, an existence that is said to continue until the dawn of the Father's gnosis. It is this nightmarish life and the deliverance from it that the writer now proceeds to describe vividly.

The introduction (28:32-29:8) sets the scene for the parable that follows. Those who are without gnosis from the Father experience terror, confusion, and instability. The four verbs in the imperfect tense (νενοει, 28:32; ενεθεν, 29:1; ηεγοει, 29:1-2; ηενη, 29:5) emphasize that the condition described, though at one time continually true, now has changed through the dawning of Divine gnosis. That is, the description is that of a gnostic who, from his enlightened standpoint, views the darkness in which he once lived.²

1. The nightmare (29:8-25). The parable proper begins with the last word of 29:8. The human condition is like to those who are settled down to sleep and find themselves in disturbing dreams.

¹ Grobel, *op. cit.*, p. 117, note 300.

² Cf. the imperfect verb ηηε in Rom. 6:17. Paul's thanksgiving in behalf of the Christians at Rome was that, though once they were constantly serving sin, now the servitude is ended.

2. The awakening (29:25-31). With the final word of 29:25, i.e. **уа** "until," the awakening from the nightmare is introduced. The clause beginning with **уа** should be linked to the beginning of the parable in 29:8-11. That is, the human condition is "like to those who are settled down to sleep and find themselves in disturbing dreams... until the moment when they who normally pass through all these things arise" (29:8-11, 25-28). To this observation, the writer adds that the awakened one realizes that in all the nightmarish experience which seemed so real at the time, he was actually seeing nothing because they (i.e. the troubling dreams) are nothing (29:28-31).

3. The meaning (29:32-30:14). The clause **ѿприте прите не пее** (29:32-33) introduces the meaning of the parable. This means that the **ѿприте** in 29:32 is the complement to the same word found in 29:8. The translation of the entire section, therefore, from 29:8 to 29:35 is to be construed as follows: "Just as those who are settled down to sleep and find themselves in disturbing dreams 29:8-11 ... until ... they... arise, 29:25-26... just so is the way of those who have tossed Ignorance from them", 29:32-35.¹

The author concludes the section by observing that this is the way each one has acted for so long a time as he was without gnosis, and that this is the way of his straightening up (30:6-12). Finally, the writer pronounces a kind of blessing on the Gnostic who has returned to himself and who has awakened (30:12-14). The end of the paragraph comes in 30:14.²

X. THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN BEHALF OF THE Gnostics (30:14-31:1)

The section begins with an ascription of blessing to the Holy Spirit, the first word being the borrowed Greek term **μακαριος** (30:14-15). Although Grobel³ and Schenke⁴ think that the writer means that Jesus (or the Father) opens the eyes of the blind, it seems quite probable that the Holy Spirit is the subject of both perfect verbs, **птаѿоуни** (30:15), and **дѿпѡт неѡѿ** (30:17). Moreover, the Spirit is said to give his hand to those who are

¹ The parable (29:8-31) and its meaning (29:32-30:14) will be considered in greater detail in chap. III, propos. II.

² Thus Schenke, *op. cit.*, p. 45, against Grobel, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 119, note 316.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 45.

prostrate on the ground and to set them on their feet (for not yet before this time had they ever risen up), and to give them the means of understanding the gnosis which comes from the Father, even the revelation of his Son (30:19-26). The man "prostrate on the ground" reminds the reader of the previous section, i.e. the parable of the nightmare. The Holy Spirit is presented as the means or possibility (πῑτε, 30:26) of understanding. This idea approaches the teaching on the Holy Spirit found in John 16:12-15, especially v. 14, "He will glorify me, for he will take what is mine and declare it to you." If the conjunction οὐαδρα (30:24) be understood to mean "even" (cf. the use of καί in Greek), then the gnosis which stems from the Father is here identified with the revelation of the Son. This shows a high Christology and a ministry of the Holy Spirit not unlike that found in the New Testament. Pl. 30:28-32 is to be rendered, "He [i.e. the Spirit] allowed them [i.e. the Gnostics] to take and to smell and to lay hold of the beloved Son." Certainly, to a degree, the writer shows an appreciation for the work of the Spirit as the gospel of John presents it.

XI. THE WORK OF JESUS FOR THE Gnostics (31:1-35)

The writer views the work of Jesus as primarily for the Gnostics. He affirms that *hulic* men (οὐλῑ, 31:4) were strangers who were never seeing (two imperfects in 31:1-2, i.e. ηετοει and ηετηετ) his form and thus failed to know him (ηεἰποτοκοτη, 31:3-4). Beginning with the causal xe in 31:4, the writer gives the reason why *hulic* men failed to know him. He appeared ηταγει αδαλ, 31:4-5) in flesh (cαρz) which had such a form that no one could obstruct his manner of life.¹ That there is some reference to the incarnation can hardly be doubted. The text has, however, a special gnostic turn due to the claim of incorruptibility and incomprehensibility for this *sarx*. It will not do to say that the position of *Ev. Ver.* relative to the incarnation is the very position which John attacks (1 John 4:2 and 2 John 7). There is no denial in *Ev. Ver.* that Jesus Christ has actually come in the flesh, but only the claim that his flesh was of such a nature that no one could obstruct his manner of life in the world.

¹ The word for "manner of life" is ηἱτημααρε (31:6-7), a noun formation based on ααρε, the A₂ form of μοογε, "to walk." The noun formation is equivalent to the Greek noun ἀναστροφή.

Beginning with 31:9 and continuing into 31:35, the writer sets forth three evidences of the incarnation.

1. The teaching ministry of Jesus (31:9-20). No time or place is expressed, but in view of the preceding context, one understands that the text refers to his ministry on earth. The teaching ministry is stated in broad non-specific terms. One can conclude, however, that Divine teaching is mediated through the Son (cf. John 7:16-17).

2. The complete defeat of Error (31:21-28). The reference to "fetters" calls to mind the captivity in which Error holds men, according to the writer (17:34 ff.).

3. The significance which Jesus has come to have for men. He is a way for the straying, gnosis for those without knowledge, a discovery for those who were seeking, strength for those who were trembling, and undefilement for those who were defiled (31:28-35).

XII. JESUS, THE GOOD SHEPHERD (31:35-32:30)

This section is one that closely relates to the New Testament. It contains four clear divisions.

1. The parable of the lost sheep (31:35-32:4). The opening words in 31:35, **ⲉⲛⲧⲁϥ ⲛⲉ ⲛⲱⲱⲥ**, "He indeed is the shepherd," reveal both a connection with the immediate context (31:28-35) and with the gospel parables of Jesus the shepherd (cf. Matt. 18:12-14 and Luke 15:3-7 who uses the term **παραβολή**, with John 10:1-18, 25-30 where the term is **παροιμία**). The five Coptic verbs (four in the perfect, one in the temporal tense) of which the shepherd is the subject, parallel exactly the verbal forms used in Matt. 18:12-14, including their order (**ἀφῆσει**, **πορευθείς**, **ζητεῖ**, **εὑρεῖν**, **χαίρει**).

The Lucan parallel has **καταλείπει** for **ἀφῆσει** and omits the verb **ζητεῖν**. Moreover, Luke includes the additional ideas of the lamb placed on the shoulders of the shepherd and the celebration of the shepherd with his friends. On the whole, one finds that the *Ev. Ver.* text reproduces the parable in a simple, terse way.

2. The meaning of the parable (32:4-17). The interest of the writer centers in the numbers 99 and 100. As the lost sheep is found, the number 99 which indicates deficiency, becomes 100 which indicates completeness. That is, 99 = the left hand, 100, the right. It has been observed that *Ev. Ver.* reflects an ancient method of counting, by means of the left hand (up through 99), and by means

of the right (from 100 on).¹ The real question, however, is, what does the writer of *Ev. Ver.* mean?

a. First, it seems certain that the number 100 is the sign (ⲡⲓⲙⲁⲉⲓⲛⲉ, 32:16) of the Father. Pl. 32:16-17 reads, "It [i.e. 100] is the sign of the one who is in their voice. It is the Father." The reading ⲡⲟⲩⲣⲣⲁⲩ, "their voice" (32:17) is difficult, though it probably means that the Gnostics alone can "voice" or articulate the Father's name.² Thus, the fact that the shepherd seeks out the one sheep that has strayed means that men by themselves cannot come to know the Father and speak of him, and that without the work of the shepherd the Father would not be known.

b. Second, the parable means that completeness is to be found only in the Father (= the right hand).

c. Third, the writer apparently alludes to passages in the New Testament which refer to the "hand" or "right hand" (Matt. 25:31 ff.; John 10:25-30; Hebr. 1:13). Moreover, the use of the verb ⲥⲱⲕ "to draw, attract" (32:12) may be an allusion to the magnetic power of the Father or of Jesus in John's gospel (cf. the use of ⲥⲱⲕ in the Sahidic and A₂ versions of John 6:44; 12:32).

3. The day of the discovery in the parable (32:18-22). By the clause, "for the sheep which he found seeing that it had fallen into the pit," the writer identifies the sheep with the one described earlier (32:3-4). He thus weaves together two different parables of Jesus (Luke 15:4-6 or Matt. 18:12-14 and Luke 14:5) as though they were one. The day is the Sabbath.

4. The lesson derived from the day (32:22-30). Beginning with the conjunction ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥⲉ (32:22), the writer becomes the preacher by directing the attention of the readers first-hand to the meaning of the second part of the parable. As the plates of the original text indicate (by marginal signs) at 32:23 and 32:38, and as the editors have observed,³ lines 38-39 are to be read after the first two words of 32:23, i.e. after ⲭⲁⲙⲉ ⲡⲣⲱⲛⲧ. The scribal error was due undoubtedly to homoioteleuton. The scribe discovered the error and remedied it before he completed the page.⁴

Once before (17:28-29) the writer has used the direct approach with his readers. In this case, however, his exhortation is sustained

¹ Cf., e.g. the discussion in Grobel, *op. cit.*, pp. 129, 131.

² Thus Schenke, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

³ *Ev. Ver.*, "notes critiques," p. 58.

⁴ Cf. Till, *Orientalia*, N.S., (1958), 278, and Grobel, *op. cit.*, p. 137, note 366.

continuing into the next section in pl. 33. He draws two meanings from the parable.

a. First, the parable is told "in order that you, the children of understanding, may understand... what the Sabbath is, in which it is not fitting that salvation be idle" (32:22-23a, 38-39). The writer shows not only an awareness of the Jewish economy—there is a Sabbath—but he implies that Divine salvation was operative in that economy. The new thing indicated by the second part of the parable is that Jesus works to bring salvation to men even on the Jewish day of rest. He did this when he was here (cf. the verb $\text{HTA}\overline{\text{Y}}\text{SINT}\overline{\text{Y}}$ in 32:19); he continues to do it. Pl. 32:24-25 is to be rendered, "It doesn't go [cf. *Crum*, 697b, line 3] for salvation to be idle in it [i.e. in the Sabbath]." That is, it didn't go when Jesus was here and it doesn't go now. An allusion to the fifth chapter of John's gospel is quite clear in this section.

b. Second, the parable is told "in order that¹ you may speak" (32:26). The parable means that the Gnostics are to bear some kind of witness. Pl. 32:26-30 is to be rendered, "in order that you may speak concerning the Day which is above—it has no night there—and concerning the Light which does not grow dim because it is perfect." By the word "Light," the writer probably means Christ.² That is, just as the section begins with a reference to Jesus the Shepherd, so it closes with a reference to Jesus the Light (also Day) from above.

Thus the two-fold lesson is drawn from the parable. First, salvation is not idle. Second, Gnostics are not to be idle either; they are to speak forth concerning the light which they have received from above. Thus the writer senses that Gnostics have a mission to perform, a witness to bear. It is this note of witness which the writer continues in the next section.

XIII. EXHORTATION TO THE Gnostics CONCERNING THEIR LIFE IN THIS WORLD (32:31-33:32)

The stage has been set for this section by the previous passage on the Gnostic witness (32:22-30). Now the writer is ready to speak in detail concerning that witness.

¹ The conjunction of purpose XERACE introduces both meanings which the parable is said to contain (32:22, 26).

² Against Grobel, *op. cit.*, p. 139, note 372, but cf. his reference to the *Manichaean Psalm-Book* 193:19.

1. Exhortation concerning the Gnostic word of witness (32:31-37).

The imperative $\omega\epsilon\chi\epsilon$ occurs twice in this section (32:31, 35), yet the exhortation is basically the same—"speak concerning the Truth . . . and Gnosis" (32:35-36). The word of witness is to come from the heart (32:31). The writer affirms that his readers can bear this witness because they are possessed by Divine revelation. In the clause, "the Light is set (qual. $\epsilon\gamma\omicron\upsilon\eta\eta\omicron$) in you which does not go out," the writer indicates two things; first, the Light is from God, and second, God will sustain this Light in the Gnostics. The word of witness pertains to the Truth ($\alpha\tau\alpha\eta\epsilon$, 32:35), i.e. the Truth concerning the Father. It is a discriminating witness, directed to those who seek the Truth. The difference from the witness of the disciples of Jesus is at once apparent (cf. e.g. Matt. 28:18-20; Acts 1:8).

2. Exhortations concerning the Gnostic life of witness (33:1-32).

In 33:1-8, the first group of six imperatives—all positive—may have been suggested to the writer by the six-fold ministration that the followers of Christ perform in his behalf (Matth. 25:35-36) though there is a clear parallel between only two of the six parts.

Ev. Ver. 33:1-8

1. Strengthen feet of stumbling ones
2. Stretch hands to the sick
3. Feed the hungry
4. Give rest to the weary
5. Raise those who desire it
6. Wake the sleeping

Matt. 25:35-36

1. Hungry—you fed me
2. Thirsty—you gave me to drink
3. Stranger—you took me in
4. Naked—you clothed me
5. Sick—you visited me
6. In prison—you came to me

The text of 33:8-11 is difficult to understand. It seems, however, to mean that as Gnostic believers minister to others (cf. 33:1-8), they, in turn, become stronger.

Another group of imperatives (mainly negative) follow:

1. Take heed to yourselves alone (33:11-12, cf. 1 Tim. 4:16).
2. Do not heed other things which you have cast forth from yourselves (33:12-14).
3. Don't turn back to eat what you have vomited forth (33:14-16). Both this prohibition and the previous one express a strong injunction not to go back to the old life of Ignorance and darkness.
4. Do not be moth-eaten, do not be worm-eaten because you have discarded it¹ (33:14-18). The sentences are apparently a

¹ The third person sing. masc. suffix in the form $\alpha\alpha\alpha\gamma$ (33:18) is difficult. The antecedent should be a masc. sing. also, whereas the main sentence with

development of the thought of 33:13-14. That is, the writer is apparently saying, "Because you have already discarded that life in which moths and worms are active (i.e. the material *hulic* existence), don't allow yourselves to become embroiled again in it."

5. Don't give any place to the Devil because you have already brought him to ruin (33:19-21). The verb "bring to ruin" is common in the Coptic New Testament (cf. e.g. 1 Cor. 15:26; Rom. 4:14). The writer's thought may be similar to Mark 3:27 where the strong man is bound and rendered inoperative.

6. Don't strengthen your obstacles (33:22-23). The meaning is obscure. Schenke¹ believes the "obstacles" refer to the earthly body, Grobel,² "earthly treasures."

Difficulties in translation and meaning continue from 33:24-30. Whatever else the passage may mean, the writer does attempt to distinguish a lawless man from a righteous man. As a kind of summary of this entire section, the writer urges his readers to do the will of God (33:30-31), the reason being added, "because you are forth-ones of him," i.e. you are from him.

In general, one can conclude that the "negative" imperatives (33:11-23) provide the necessary back-drop for an understanding of the "positive" commands (33:1-8). The Gnostic word of witness (32:31-37) and life of witness (33:1-32) are geared to one main purpose—to bring to the one who is engulfed in ignorance and darkness the "gospel" of the Father's gnosis. This means that those who have stumbled, the sick, the hungry, and the weary (33:1-5), are not so physically but spiritually. The concern of the writer is not for man's body but for his soul.

XIV. THE FORTUNE OF THE FATHER'S AROMA (33:3-35:22)

This section begins with an assurance that the Father is gracious and good (33:33-35), and that he has exercised foreknowledge with respect to his sons (33:35-39). The main theme of the section begins at the end of 33:39, "Because the sons of the Father are his aroma" (33:39-34:1). They are the Father's aroma (ⲉⲧⲁⲣⲓ) by virtue of the fact that they are forth-ones from the grace of

its double prohibition (33:16-17) contains two possible antecedents—"worm" and "moth." Perhaps the suffix is to be taken as a collective object referring to both antecedents. Till, *ZNTW*, 50 (1959), 179, suggests that the suffix means "this stage," i.e. of life.

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 49, note 5a.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 145, note 397.

his presence. The metaphor of the Father's aroma has two New Testament passages in the background—2 Cor. 2:14-16 and Mark 14:3-9 (cf. also Matt. 26:6-13; John 12:3-8). It should be observed that the Matthaean and Markan references connect the anointing incident with the εὐαγγέλιον (cf. Matt. 26:13; Mark 14:9) just as *Ev. Ver.* connects the idea of the Father's aroma with the Logos of the good news of the discovery of the *pleroma* (cf. 34:34-36). Thus, according to *Ev. Ver.*,

1. The sons of the Father are his aroma.
2. The Father unstintingly manifests his aroma in every place.
3. The Father's aroma becomes mixed with ϑῦλη, i.e. matter (34:5-6). The writer's thought in 34:5-7 is somewhat obscure. The text may be translated, "And although it [i.e. the aroma] is mixed with matter, he [i.e. the Father] gives his aroma to the Light." This may mean the eventual separation of the aroma from matter by means of death.¹ Thus the Father demonstrates the complete supremacy of his aroma over everything material, i.e. sight and sound (34:8-9).
4. The Father's aroma can only be sensed by the gift of the Spirit (34:9-12).
5. The Spirit or the Aroma draws the imparted aroma back to the place from which it went forth (34:12-18). The *praesens consuetudinis* ὑπαγεωκ (34:12) points to a recurring work. The paragraph reveals that the aroma that has been given to men is now attracted back to the Father who gave it, i.e. back to the place from which it went forth. For the use of the verb εωκ, one may compare John 6:44; 12:32 where the A₂ version uses the same word. Drawn back toward him, the aroma sinks down (34:13) in the aroma of the Father. From 34:9-18a, the text contains one continuous sentence which may be rendered,

"And it [the imparted aroma] sinks down into the aroma of the Father, and he allows it to settle there from whence it [i.e. the imparted aroma] went forth out of that first aroma [i.e. the Father], which [i.e. the imparted aroma] became cold."

Here is the cycle of Gnostic redemption in *Ev. Ver.* God lays claim to something in the world. The aroma which he himself gave is to find its destiny in the Father. He draws it back to himself.

6. The aroma departs into the world and is delivered (34:18-

¹ Thus Grobel, *op. cit.*, p. 149, note 421.

34). The aroma that was once warm became cold in the world. Its fortune, says the writer, is like the fortune of the cold rain that strikes the soil (34:18-22). The warm breeze (= the Holy Spirit) blows upon that soil imparting warmth to the cold water (= the imparted aroma) that has entered the soil, and thus it evaporates $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\acute{\iota}\omega\lambda$, 34:24), i.e. it is lifted out of the soil back into the atmosphere (= the return of the imparted aroma, now aglow with the warmth of the Spirit, to the Father).¹

The application of the metaphor begins in 34:27. It may be summed up in three main thoughts.

a. The cold aromas are due to (a wall of) separation (34:26-27). The separation ($\pi\upsilon\pi\omega$ [$\iota\upsilon\epsilon$]) refers, of course, to the separation from the Father or the Father's place. The imparted aroma left the Father to enter the world, away from the warmth of the Father's love.

b. God² came to demolish the wall of separation (34:28-29).

c. God came to make the coldness his redemption (34:30-34).

Thus, what pl. 34:28 ff. emphasizes is the Father's concern for his claim in the world, his concern that the wall of separation between him and his imparted aroma (= his elect) might be broken.

In the conclusion of the section, the writer identifies his previous metaphorical treatment with the gospel. His first sentence begins at the end of 34:34 and does not end until 35:6a. It can be rendered as follows:

¹ The force of the metaphor has been lost in various translations. Thus Till, *ZNTW*, 50 (1959), p. 180, Schenke, *op. cit.*, p. 50, Grobel, *op. cit.*, p. 154, and the three translations in *Ev. Ver. Supplementum*, pp. 5, 25, 31, all give the meaning, "to draw, attract" to the verb $\epsilon\omega\kappa$ ($\epsilon\alpha\kappa$, 34:26). It is true that $\epsilon\omega\kappa$ has the meaning "to draw" in this very context (34:12). But the verb has also the well-attested meaning to "blow as wind" (*Crum*, 325a). Quite probably this is the sense of the verb in 34:25-26. The writer arrived at this meaning of the verb in *Ev. Ver.* 34:26 quite independently. Later he found the same meaning assigned to the passage by E. Segelberg in an article titled, "Evangelium Veritatis—a Confirmation Homily and its Relation to the Odes of Solomon," *Orientalia Suecana*, VIII (1959), 3-42.

² Thus understanding with Schenke, *op. cit.*, p. 50, and Grobel, *op. cit.*, p. 155, note 446, the reading $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon$ in 34:28-29. The reading $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon$ "faith" or "trust," is printed in the text of *Ev. Ver. Supplementum*, p. 4, while the *notes critiques*, p. 16, suggest that the writer introduces successively in this section the triad of New Testament words—faith, love, and hope (1 Thess. 1:3). Thus "faith" (34:28-29), "love" ($\tau\alpha\alpha\pi\eta$, 34:31), and "hope" ($\rho\epsilon\lambda\pi\varsigma$, 35:3).

"This is the Logos of the good news of the discovery of the *pleroma* for those who wait before him for the salvation which comes forth from above downward, while stretched out is the [lit. "their"] hope of the ones who wait in it, whose likeness is the light which has no shadow."

The sentence emphasizes two things; Divine salvation is a discovery and involved in that discovery is the earnest hope and expectation of men. No less than three times does the writer use the verb *κατατε* "to stretch out." Both the meaning of the word and its repetition lay stress on the human element. Those who possess the hope of the good news resemble the light, "because they are akin to it, because they came from it and are now coming to it."¹ It is in response to men who expect his coming that the Father comes and effects their repentance (35:6-23). The work referred to in 35:18 may very well include the sweep of the wider context of this whole section, a work manifested in the Father's aroma, in the response of the imparted aroma to the wooing of the Holy Spirit, in the coming of God, in the discovery of salvation and hope, etc. (33:33 ff.). All of this is a work for falling down, i.e. a work that produces adoration and worship in believing Gnostic hearts,² "a giving-rest-and-raising-one-up-work"³ (35:18-20). All of this occurs, says the writer, "in (the time of) the discovery of that one who came to him [i.e. to the Gnostic], of that one who will cause him [i.e. the Gnostic] to return" (35:20-22). Thus, the writer tries to strike a balance between the salvation wrought by God and the human response to it. It is a work of God for only he can give rest to the troubled one and only he can set upright the prostrate one (35:18-20) and only he can cause the straying one to return (35:21-22). Man, however, must make the discovery of this person and of his work, i.e. "of that one who came to him" and of "that one who will cause him to return."

The final sentence, "For this return is called repentance" (*μετανοια*) is a fitting conclusion to this section. The section began with an emphasis on the sons of the Father who go forth as his aroma. Now they return, says the writer, in repentance.

¹ Grobel, *op. cit.*, p. 157, note 456.

² But cf. Grobel, *ibid.*, p. 161, note 469.

³ Cf. Till, *ZNTW*, 50 (1959), 180, *eine ruhende Sich-aufrichte-Sache*.

XV. THE FATHER'S FULLNESS (= FORGIVENESS)
FOR THE ONE WHO LACKS (35:24-36:13)

The introductory **εἰς τὸ** **πᾶν** "on account of this," in 35:24 shows the close connection of this section to the preceding one. In order to effect repentance (35:23), the Father (= the Imperishable one) breathes out, i.e. he pursues the one who has sinned (35:24-26). In one sense the verb **πνεῖ** (35:25) carries on the thought of the previous section, where, in the metaphor of the aroma from the Father which has grown cold, a breath (breeze, i.e. **πνεῖ**) blows on it and it becomes warm (34:25-26). So here, in 35:24-27, in order to bring back the one who has sinned and give rest to him, the Father's breath goes forth in pursuit of the erring one. This text and 32:37 comprise the only references to "sin" in *Ev. Ver.* The idea of the text is a bold one. The Imperishable one pursues the sinner not to punish him but to give him rest. With the mention of sin, it is natural to read of forgiveness in the next line (35:27). What is forgiveness? The writer's answer is found in 35:27-29. First, he affirms that forgiveness is the excess of the light (shining) in the Lack (35:27-28). Apparently the writer is emphasizing the boundlessness of the Father (cf. 35:10-11). The Divine light always shines, far beyond this material world. One experiences in forgiveness merely an "extra" or an "excess" of that Light in much the same way, apparently, that one enjoys the extra or excess of sunlight which strikes the earth. The main point of the definition, however, is that God is at work with the Light of his forgiveness in the very place of Lack or need, i.e. in the material world. The Father has a definite interest in the cosmos. Second, forgiveness is the word of the *pleroma* (35:29). It is the manifestation of Divine wholeness or completeness for human lack. Forgiveness is a Divine word. In this respect, *Ev. Ver.* is in basic agreement with the New Testament (cf., e.g. Mark 2:5; Luke 7:48).

By means of the conjunction **καὶ** in 35:30, the writer illustrates the point he has made. The Imperishable one pursues the one who has sinned to bring him rest and forgiveness (35:24 ff.): the doctor hastens to the bedside of the one who is ill (35:30 ff.). No fewer than three marks of the true doctor are found in the parable; he hastens to the bedside of the patient, he desires to be there where the patient is, and he has what the patient lacks.¹

¹ Cf. chapter III, propos. II for a further treatment of the parable.

The application of the parable (35:35-36:5) goes far beyond the illustration. The Father's fullness fills the one who lacks in order that he might receive grace (36:1-3). The "sick one" (ὑγιής) of the parable is now seen to be the one who dwindles away in the place where there is no grace. The brief statement of the parable to the effect that the doctor has what the patient lacks, is developed. That is, the fullness that the Father manifests to the who is abased is nothing less than the discovery of the Light of the Truth, Truth which cannot change (36:12-13).

The entire section, 35:24-36:13, is dominated by the doctor-patient parable. The Father with his fullness is able and willing to act in behalf of man in his need. Man uncovers the need (cf. 28:26-28). As that need is revealed, the Divine fullness is said to appear and fill the deficient one and enlighten him with the light of Truth.

XVI. THE ANOINTING OF CHRIST (36:13-35a)

The anointing is the mercy of the Father. At the same time the anointing is a seal placed on those whom the Father has filled (cf. the preceding section). Unlike the anointing-seals with which men seal ordinary jars and which are sometimes destroyed, the anointing-seal of Christ is permanent. Even if lack is found in the human vessel that he has sealed, the Father being perfect ordinarily fills it again. The parable or metaphor of the anointing-seals (36:21-29) is intended by the writer to enforce his argument. The parable contains the following parts:

1. Men anoint a full vessel with a seal.
2. If the seal breaks, the contents of the vessel are lost.
3. A wind blows on the open vessel and the contents evaporate(?).¹

There are also three parts apparent in the application of the parable:

1. Christ anoints those who have received the Father's fullness or completeness (36:19-20).
2. The anointing-seal is the Father's mercy (36:17-18).
3. The seal of the Father on his own is not ordinarily broken, i.e. they are kept by him (36:29-32). This third part contrasts

¹ The difficulty in rendering 36:27-29 is discussed in *Ev. Ver. Supplementum*, p. 20, and in Grobel, *op. cit.*, p. 171, note 511. Whether one translates "a wind draws it," or, "a wind blows upon it" is not of great importance. The clause, "one with the force which is with it" apparently is to be taken in apposition to "wind," but this is not clear.

sharply with the parable. The parable ends by observing the possible dissolution of the anointing-seal of a vessel, and thus, the loss of its contents. In the application, however, the writer insists that the anointing-seal is not broken. The text reads, "But [ΑΛΛΑ] indeed [ἮΤΑΙ] from this one who is without lack, no seal is ordinarily separated." And, the writer adds, should there be any lack, the Father being perfect fills it.

XVII. THE FATHER'S PARADISE (36:35-37:3)

The connection of this section with what precedes is not very clear. One may possibly conclude that just as the Father through his anointing-seal preserves those vessels that are his (36:29-35), so he plants them as his plantings in his Paradise (36:35 ff.). The concluding statement of this brief section (36:39-37:3) evidently holds in view the plantings and the paradise. The word **παι** (36:39) is singular in number and thus probably has paradise as its antecedent. Paradise constitutes the very acme of perfection in the Father's thought. The word **παι** (37:2) is plural and thus has **νισο** (36:36) as its logical antecedent. Contrary to Grobel,¹ the prefix **παι** in **παιμακκεκ** (37:3) probably refers to the Father. The Gnostics are his plantings and likewise they are the "words" of his meditation.

XVIII. THE FATHER'S WORD AND WORDS (37:4-18)

The following steps are indicated in this section:

1. The words were in the depth of his thought.
2. The Word came forth first. The time of his coming was set by the Father's will.
3. The Word revealed the words and the Father's *nous*.

The writer emphasizes twice that the Logos was the first to come forth (37:8-9, 15-16). This may be his way of expressing the New Testament idea of Jesus as *πρωτότοκος ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς* (Rom. 8:29; cf. also Col. 1:15, 18; Rev. 1:5; Hebr. 1:6). The Logos alone can manifest the various *logoi* who exist (**ενο**, qual. of **ειπε**, 37:7) in the Father's thought. Once again, the writer may be reflecting a New Testament background, e.g. Ephes. 1:4 *ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*. Quite clearly, however, whether it be the coming of the Logos or the manifestation

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 173, note 520.

of the *logoi*, everything hinges upon the Divine will. The final sentence (37:15-18) reads, "So it happened that he [i.e. the Logos] was the first to come forth at the time when it was pleasing to the will of him who willed it."

XIX. THE FATHER'S WILL (37:19-38:6)

This section is developed as follows:

1. The satisfaction of the Father in his will (37:19-21). The first sentence is closely linked to the previous one (37:15-18) and is to be rendered, "Now the will is that in which the Father rests himself and that which pleases him."

2. The sovereignty of his will (37:21-24). Grammatically, the sense of this sentence could be either, "nothing ever happens without him... apart from his will," or, "no one ever comes into existence without him... apart from his will."

3. The transcendence of his will (37:24-34). A unique idea occurs in 37:25-26, "His footstep is the will." A footstep or footprint is that which one leaves behind him as he goes where he wills or does what he wills. The idea seems to be that man cannot embrace God's will. He can only understand from some trace of his presence that God's will is at work in the world. So transcendent is his will, says the writer, that one can neither know it nor observe it, and, as a result (ϣιηα, 37:28), one cannot comprehend it. The writer probably alludes to Rom. 11:33.¹ The writer continues by insisting that the will of God stands firm even though the sight of that will at work is not pleasing to men, adding that, "The [sovereign] will is in everything before God" (37:29-34). The translation of 37:33-34 understands ποσωγε to be the subject of εἶναι which has a verbal meaning, "to be in" (cf. 18:17; 22:28; 27:14). The ordinary particle ἡτοι which precedes the nominative is missing, according to this explanation. Compare, however, 18:16 for a similar omission. The rendering offered above avoids the insertion of the particle νε after εἶναι λανε such as Till suggests.² The one certain reference in *Ev. Ver.* to the name "God" occurs in 37:33 (cf. the discussion on 34:28).

4. The eternity of his will (37:34-37). The Father's will spans the extent of time. He knows both the beginning and the end of all (37:34-35).

¹ Cf. Schenke, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

² *ZNTW*, 50 (1959), 182, note 45.

5. The aim of his will (37:37-38:6). Context rules that the noun **τοϑαν** "the goal," expresses the true aim of the Father's will, as the writer understands it. In brief, the Father wills that men receive gnosis of the hidden one (= the Father, cf. 20:19-20, though cf. also the use of the qual. form of **ϑωρι** for the Son in 24:12-13; 27:8). The text of 37:38-38:6 may be rendered, "Now this is the Father, the one from whom went forth the beginning, the one to whom shall return all of those who went forth from him and became manifest (as) a glory and (as) a joy of his name." This is one of the clearest sections in *Ev. Ver.* At the beginning, men went forth from the Father in whom they existed. The goal consists in a return to him by means of redemption, a redemption accomplished as men receive gnosis of him. It is this gnosis of him that enables men here in this world to reveal the glory and joy of his name.

This entire section (37:19-38:6) is important because of the positive way it affirms the sovereignty of the Father's will and for the evident way it differs from other gnostic doctrine. Grobel¹ draws attention to Irenaeus' statement concerning God's will, a statement which Irenaeus affirms to be diametrically opposed to the gnostic doctrine of his day. Irenaeus writes, *Homo etenim a se non videt Deum. Ille autem volens videtur ab hominibus, a quibus vult, et quando vult, et quemadmodum vult.*² The affirmation is in basic agreement with 37:19-38:6.

XX. THE FATHER'S NAME (38:6-40:29)

This is the longest section in *Ev. Ver.* It sustains throughout an emphasis on the main subject. It begins with the claim, "Now the name of the Father is the Son" (38:6-7) and closes with the assurance, "He gave the name to him who came forth from the depth..." (40:26 ff.). The writer affirms that the Son who is the Logos bears the Father's name and is himself the Father's name.³ The Son is the revelation of the Father (cf. John 14:9; 17:6).

The closing sentence of the previous section prepares the way for this treatment. Those who return to the Father were manifest (in the world) as a glory and joy of his name (37:3-6). What is the name?

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 177, note 542.

² *Adv. H.*, IV, 20, 5 (Harvey, *op. cit.*), II, 216.

³ Cf. Schenke, *op. cit.*, p. 53, note 1a.

The writer answers:

1. The name of the Father is the Son (37:6-7).
2. The Father at the first (**ἡψαρπ**, 38:7-8, cf. *Crum*, 587b) gave a name to the one who came forth from him (38:7-9). To this statement the writer adds, "Yea [**εἰταϛ**] he [the Father] is the same [i.e. the Son]" (38:9-10). This is the reading of the text. It is comparable to John 10:30, "I and the Father are one" (RSV). And yet, "the Father begot him as a Son" (38:10-11), perhaps another allusion to the incarnation.
3. The Father gave his name to the Son (38:11-15).
4. The name is invisible (38:16-27). The claim is supported by an argument (38:17-21), "Because it [the name] alone is the mystery of the Invisible one which comes to ears which are full through it [i.e. through the name]." If by "name," the writer means "nature," then the argument is clear. The Son can be seen and was seen in that he came into the midst (cf. 19:19), but his name, i.e. his essential nature, is invisible. This is a mystery, says the writer, but it is not insoluble since it comes to the ears of those who are filled with his name (cf. Exod. 6:3; Isa. 9:5-6; Matt. 1:21). The writer insists that the name is great and able to be pronounced by God alone (38:24-27).
5. There are sons of the name (38:28-39:3). Grobel says that the phrase, "sons of the name," has a Semitic sound.¹ The "sons" are described as "those in whom the name of the Father was resting" (38:29-30), and who "rest themselves in his name" (38:31-32). Finally, the writer observes that the very plan of the Father was that his name might be on their heads (38:36-37).
6. The name is invisible (39:3-8). The writer has already stated this (cf. 38:16-21). Now, however, he contrasts the invisible name with words and titles. It is in a different category from that of words and titles because it is invisible. Only the Father who has given the name to the Son sees it (**εϛνετ αραϛ οταεετϛ**, 39:8). To give a name means to give character. "The name of a thing is the real essence behind, and denoted by, its name."²
7. The Father's name is for the one who exists (39:9-20). The Father alone can give a name to the Son. The word "alone," **οταεετϛ** occurs frequently in this section (39:7, 8, 9, 17, 18-19, 23-24; 40:19-20), and, with the exception of 39:17 where it refers

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 183, note 565.

² *Ibid.*, p. 185, note 574.

to the Gnostic, it always describes the Father. The writer observes that existence is necessary for one to possess a name. The text of 39:11-20 portrays two main types of person in this world—the a-gnostic and the gnostic, or, in the words of the text, **πετενη̅ωοον εν** “the one who does not exist” (39:11-12) and **πεε̅νταϋ ε̅τωοον**, “but he who does exist” (39:15). Grobel¹ calls attention to the error in the *Ev. Ver.* translations which make God the subject of 39:11-12, and thus fail to see the contrast between two classes of men. This section should be compared to the section on the Father's will and man's being and becoming (27:34-28:31, especially 28:16-18). In a succinct way the writer states the essential lack of the a-gnostic—he has no name (i.e. no definite nature or character) because he has no being (39:11-14). The description is tautological. Not to have a name means not to have real existence. The writer has more to say concerning the Gnostic, the one who has being (39:15-20). The contrast which he represents is set off by the pronoun of contrast **νταϋ** (39:15, cf. *Crum*, 232b). The Gnostic is said to exist “with his other name.” Neither Schenke² nor Till³ show by translation the presence of the adjective **κε-**, “other, also,” which is found in the form **πεε̅κερεν** (39:16). The meaning “his other name” perhaps indicates a new name distinct from that one received from parents in the cosmos. The sentence, “He alone knows it” (**υ̅σα̅νη̅ε̅ λ̅α̅α̅ϋ̅ ο̅τα̅ε̅ε̅τ̅**, 39:17) forms a close parallel to Rev. 2:17, “with a new name written on the stone which no one knows except him who receives it” (RSV). What is the Gnostic's name or “his other name?” The writer says that it is the Son (39:19-20). The reference is puzzling. Does it mean that the name is **χριστιανός**, or does it mean that the name of Christ is invoked upon the baptismal candidate as he is baptized? Certainly it is not the latter. *Ev. Ver.* has no clear reference to baptism. Perhaps the writer means that the nature of Christ is given to believers (cf. Rev. 3:12; 14:1).

8. Name-giving is the prerogative of the Father; its direction is from the Father to the offspring (39:20-40:2). The believer receives the name of the Son which shows that the Father did not conceal the name “in the affair” (**ϋ̅η̅ ν̅ι̅ω̅ϋ̅**, 39:21), i.e. in the affair of

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 187, note 578.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 54.

³ *ZNTW*, 50 (1959), 183. Till simply translates, *mit seinem Namen*.

the having, giving, and receiving, of the name.¹ Thus the Father did not conceal the name but the name was there (ἀλλὰ μετῴον, 39:22), i.e. with him. The contrast in 39:24-26 is probably purposeful. The contrast in Coptic involves a single letter, i.e. between πα "belongs to" and πε "is." "Moreover, the name belongs to [πα] the Father just as the name of the Father is [πε] the Son, the compassionate one." The writer means that even though the name is, in one sense, "the name of the Father" (38:37), yet the Father can bestow this name without any loss to his own being. The Son, however, does not possess the name: He is the name. In no way is he distinct from the name. The Son and the name are synonymous. Or, as the writer expresses the idea in 40:8, the name is "Lord," the Son is Lord. The Father's prerogative in name-giving is noted also in 39:27-28, "Because where is one great of name outside of the Father."

9. The name needs to be understood as the true name, the name "Lord" (40:2-16). A climax appears to be reached as the writer uses the first personal plural, urging his readers to understand with him what the name really is. The name is the true name (40:5-6). In 40:6, since the word ενσε is not otherwise known to exist, Till² divides the word into two parts, the negative εν and σε. The text can thus be rendered, "His [name], moreover, is not the name [sent] forth from the Father, because his is that [name] which exists, the name Lord" (40:6-9). The sense is that because the name exists, it cannot come into existence by being sent forth from the Father. What is already in existence cannot come into existence.

It is quite certain that "the name Lord" stands in an attributive position to πετῳον "that which exists." The phrase thus construed fits in every way the evidence *Crum* gives (p. 215 a-b) on the use of the genitive particle π with a following attributive. Some of his examples are as follows:

Josh. 4:7 (B) πιορδανης ιερο "the Jordan river."

Sir. 36:6 (S) υβνηρ ρρετσωβε "fellow jester."

¹ Till, *Orientalia*, N.S., 27 (1958), 280, shows that ρωϣ is not the equivalent of ρωπ "secret, " but of ρωβ "work, event, affair" (cf. *Crum*, 653a). Both ρωβ and ρωϣ are A₂ spellings, according to the references in *Crum*. Both spellings are present in *Ev. Ver.*

² *Orientalia*, N.S., 27 (1958), 280.

John 18:17 (S) **τῇ δούλῃ καὶ κτηνῷ** "the maid servant, porter."

(A₂) **τῷ πατρί καὶ κυρίῳ**

Miss 4 644 (S) **πενεὶωτ ἀποφῆτης** "our father, prophet."

C 89 30 (B) **ὁ υἱὸς ἀδελφῆς** "a brother, monk."

In each case, whether the relative clause or noun which precedes the **καὶ** is definite or indefinite, the word that follows and which is joined to **καὶ** does not have the article. Thus, e.g., in John 18:17 (S) **δούλῃ** has the feminine article preceding it, but **κτηνῷ** that is joined to **καὶ** does not. The word **κυρίῳ** however, in Sir. 36:6 is indefinite, likewise the noun **πενεὶωτ** which follows the **καὶ** (probably because of assimilation). Thus in *Ev. Ver.* 40:7-9, the word **πενεὶωτ** is a definite relative clause. Therefore, the two attributive nouns (double example of the attributive noun after **καὶ**) that follow are also to be understood as definite. The proper noun **κύριος** is followed by the noun to which it refers, i.e. "the Lord with respect to name," = "the name Lord." Compare the example given from Josh. 4:7 (B) **πιορδανης ποταμοῦ**, "the Jordan with respect to rivers" = "the river Jordan."¹ Thus the writer of *Ev. Ver.* is saying that the reason why the name does not go forth from the Father is because the name is the name Lord, and because of this it exists with the Father. In another sense, however, the name is given, a fact that the writer has affirmed by repeating the verb **ἔρεν**. The indication is that the Son received the name not on loan (**ἐν ἀποσχηῇ**, 40:10, cf. *Crum*, 503b and the Sah. of 2 Kings 6:5), "according to the way in which each one is supplied with a name" (lit. "with it"). The illustration which the writer offers beginning with 40:10 is not clear. Each person is supplied with a name. Does the writer mean that, in this case, the name *is* given on loan, i.e. for the span of life which one lives in the cosmos, at the end of which life it has no further use? The answer is not clear. Likewise when the writer says that the Son did not receive the name Lord on loan, does he mean that he received it permanently? What the writer does state clearly is that the Father gave the name Lord to no one else (40:13-16).

10. The name was spoken by the Father when the Son came forth

¹ The attributive genitive functions (in the above illustrations) like the Greek genitive of content and apposition. Cf. F. Blass, A. Debrunner, R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University Press, 1961), p. 92, § 167.

(40:16-29). The writer's idea in this section seems to be as follows:

- a. The name cannot be uttered except by the Father, the perfect one (cf. 1 Cor. 12:3).
- b. The Father was pleased to have the name in the Son.
- c. The Father gave the name to the Son and the Son came forth and spoke the hidden things of the Father.

XXI. THE FATHER'S PLACE AND HIS OWN WHO COME TO BE THERE (40:30-43:24)

Ev. Ver. opened with the theme of the one who came forth from the *pleroma* for the redemption of those who were in ignorance. Now it concludes with an extended description of that *pleroma* (= the Place) and of those who will enjoy it.

Beginning with 41:5, the writer describes the work of the Son in bringing men to the place.

1. The Son will speak concerning the place (41:5).
2. He will hasten to effect a return to it (41:7).
3. He will hasten to take the Gnostic away from this place, i.e. the world, to that place, i.e. the *pleroma* (41:8). The infinitive of the compound verb, "to take away," has no expressed object, but, in view of the context, it may be assumed that the object is the Gnostic. The place from which the Son removes him is the world, further described as "the place where he stood" (41:9-10). This implies that the Gnostic has a life to live as a Gnostic in the world because he stands, i.e. he has gnosis. Men without gnosis are prostrate as men in sleep. Their whole a-gnostic life is an illusory non-existence. But this man stands for he has gnosis. He stands in the world. This world, however, is not his true home and thus the Son hastens to take him away from the world. The writer affirms, however, that even in the world, the one who stands can taste a portion of that place (= the *pleroma*) and take nourishment and grow (41:8-12).

Beginning with 41:13, the writer says that the place (i.e. beyond) is the true portion of believers because they are actually $\dagger$ "offspring" (?) of the Father (41:14-15) and *pleromata* (41:15-16) of the *pleroma* who is their root (41:17, 26). In 41:19-20, Grobel translates, "He gave them their constitution," and comments, "He created them and constituted them as they are."¹ Schenke,

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 192, 194, and 195 (note 607).

however, comes closer to the meaning. He interprets the verse to mean that he (the Father) set up their limits, i.e. in the Father.¹ The fact that the *pleroma* is the place to which gnostics direct their thoughts shows once again that their true portion, according to the writer, lies with the Father. The Father himself is their portion (41:28-35). His head becomes their resting-place (41:28-29) and they are welcomed into the *pleroma* so that they are near (ϣΗΗ, qual.) to the Father (41:30-32), and thus they can say that they have received a portion of his face (i.e. his presence) through his favors (41:32-35).

The portion and presence of the Gnostics in the *pleroma* is due entirely to the Father (41:35-42:17). A translation of 41:35-42:2 is important in this connection. It may be rendered, "But [ⲁⲉ] these do not confess in this way [i.e. by saying that they have received a portion of his presence, cf. the preceding lines, 41:32-35], because they themselves did not overcome." The particle ⲁⲉ indicates some kind of contrast with what precedes. The translation "do not confess" for Ⲙⲉⲟⲩⲁⲛⲟ . . . ⲉⲛ (41:35) has ample confirmation in *Crum* (487a) as does also the translation "overcome" for ⲡⲓⲧⲏⲉ (*Crum*, 259b). The sense of the passage seems quite clear. The Gnostics do not confess that they overcame but they do confess that the Father has overcome.² The advantage of this translation and interpretation is its close connection with the context, both the preceding context (cf. the notations above) and the following. The following passage reads, "They have not degraded the glory of the Father nor do they consider him as contemptible, nor harsh, nor wrathful" (42:3-6). The translation "degraded"³ approximates Till's rendering, *Sie haben weder den Ruhm des Vaters herabgesetzt*.⁴

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 55. Strangely enough, only the Engl. translation of the *Ev. Ver.* text, p. 109, has sensed that the Coptic noun ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲱⲩⲩ (41:20) is plural (cf. the French and German renderings by the singular, pp. 45, 83. Till, *Orientalia*, N.S., 27 (1958), 282, has corrected the German translation.

² Other translators render these lines in quite a different way. Isenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 160, translates, "But these of this kind were not manifest, because they have not risen above themselves." A translation of Till's German rendering is, "They have not raised themselves above themselves," i.e. they do not consider themselves as more than they are (*ZNTW*, 50 (1959), p. 184). Grobel, *op. cit.*, p. 195, note 614, suggests that the passage means, "they have risen above their former selves." Cf. also the textual notes of the text of *Ev. Ver.*, p. 60. Amid such diversity of understanding one must exercise caution.

³ Lit., "cut off," (cf. Gr. κόπτειν and compounds, also *Crum*, 591a).

⁴ *ZNTW*, 50 (1959), 184.

The writer describes who the Father is (42:4-10) adding that the Gnostics are from him and stretch out in ardor after him (42:11-17).

Ev. Ver. closes with a full description of the Father's place and the life of the "redeemed" there (42:17-43:24). Their destiny is not Hades but a life of rest in the Father (42:21-23). The "redeemed" know neither envy nor groaning. No death occurs among them nor do they weary themselves in a search for truth, but they themselves are the Truth, for the Father exists in them and they in the Father, and they are never to be separated from the truly Good one (42:18-30). The writer of *Ev. Ver.* thus recognizes the reality of evil and suffering in this life. And he sees beyond this life. The enlightened ones "stretch out" after the Unique and Perfect One which means that they recognize that the world is not their home and that the Father is calling them to the fullness of life with him in that place (= the *pleroma*). One can discern in this description Christian elements (cf. especially Rev. 21:1-4, 22-27). There is, however, at least one important element that is alien to the Christianity of the New Testament. It is found in the statement, "But they themselves are the Truth" (42:25-26). The New Testament speaks of the indwelling of one person by another, which may be a blessing (Col. 1:27) or a curse (John 13:27). But the New Testament knows of no absorption of one person into another, or of concrete persons into abstract concepts. Perhaps the absorption concept in *Ev. Ver.* is due to the inherent belief in the original unity of all things—in itself a Biblical idea—and to the belief that in the eschatological day, Unity will perfect the spaces (25:9-10). But whatever the reason, *Ev. Ver.* suggests that the destiny of the Gnostics is absorption into deity i.e. deification. *Ev. Ver.* has shown that man's basic need is for gnosis of God's nature which is Truth. To meet this need it declares that the gospel of Truth has come forth from the *pleroma* (16:31-35) and entered the midst (where men are) through the manifestation of Jesus Christ (26:27-28), and elicited a response from the Father's elect (26:28-32). But, according to *Ev. Ver.*, the destiny of the elect is in the Father. Thus they are caught up into him, absorbed into the Truth which he is. Grobel thinks that this is, "One more example of the tendency of the meditation to identify the redeemed with abstracts which properly describe the transcendent realm. They are the perfect day 32:32, each is a *pleroma* 41:16, they are the understanding 33:8; so here they *are* the truth. This is probably

more than hyperbole for 'you are of the Truth.' It seems to arise from identification of the redeemed with the Redeemer..."¹ "But they themselves indeed are the Truth." The syntax of the statement merits attention. The Greek word ἀλλὰ is the strong adversative while ἡμεῖς, the independent personal pronoun, and πῶ, an emphatic particle, serve to heighten the contrast. The word πῆ is a particle indicating subject and predicate in a nominal sentence. The rule that the particle agrees with the predicate in number and gender is violated since πῆ is singular and ἡμεῖς is plural. The syntax is purposeful because the writer wants to identify the redeemed Gnostics with the abstract concept of truth. A similar emphasis is present in 42:32-36 where, on the one hand, the Gnostics listen to their root, but, on the other hand, they are already those in whom the Father finds his root. Hence the Father will not cause hurt to his soul (42:36-37), his soul being the Gnostics themselves.

In 42:39, the question arises as to the identity of "the remnant, the rest (of men)." Grobel² suggests that the writer probably means "non-Christian mankind," or possibly a faction in the church. The term, however, may mean simply potential Gnostics.

The problem in 42:40-43:3 is an evident contradiction of the writer. He affirms that he has been in the place of rest (ἐαριῶνι, 43:1), and in the same breath he says that he shall be in it πῆ τῆς ἀγῶνι, 43:3). Grobel suggests that the writer is thus declaring that the experience of the new life is operative here as well as hereafter.³ Thus to paraphrase the passage, "I *have* settled down there and even now am living the life of gnosis. And yet I shall settle down there fully one day and be occupied all the time with the Father."

The *agape* of the Father that flows upon the true brothers (43:6-7) seems to echo the words of Paul in Rom. 5:5.⁴

Ev. Ver. closes (43:9-24) with a description of the character and life of the Gnostics. The description is apparently one of the life which they live in this world.

1. They live truly (43:9-10).

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 197, 199, note 624.

² *Ibid.*, p. 199, note 630 (cf. Schenke, *op. cit.*, p. 57, *alle Menschen*).

³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 199, 201, note 632.

⁴ Thus Schenke, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

2. They witness, i.e. "they speak concerning the perfect light" (43:12-13) which is full of the seed of the Father (cf. 1 John 3:9).

3. They prove to be worthy sons, the kind which the Father loves. For this cause, his Spirit rejoices within him and gives glory to him (43:16-24).

CHAPTER TWO

A COMPARISON OF THE BACKGROUNDS OF THE WRITER OF *EVANGELIUM VERITATIS* AND OF JUSTIN MARTYR IN RELATION TO THE NATURE OF TRUTH

I. THE WRITER OF *Ev. Ver.*

The writer of *Ev. Ver.* discloses neither his name nor his relation to the Christian church. He indicates nothing definite concerning non-Christian or Christian sources upon which he draws for the development of his message of redemption. Internal evidence, however, indicates the presence of both philosophical and Christian elements underlying the writer's understanding of truth.

A. The Writer's Philosophical Background in Relation to his Idea of Truth

The writer of *Ev. Ver.* was apparently influenced by both Stoic and Platonic ideas.¹

1. Stoic background. An influence of Stoicism upon the writer of *Ev. Ver.* is apparent in the area of anthropology. The original Stoic teachings come into sharp focus in the discourses of Epictetus (first century A.D.) who, in turn, was an important influence in the thought of the Stoic emperor, Marcus Aurelius (A.D. 161-180).² Epictetus claimed that while man possesses a material body in common with the animals, he shares his νοῦς with the gods.³ That is, man is part of the Divine being, a fragment of God himself.⁴ Thanks to his νοῦς or mind, man can overcome the miserable existence in which he finds himself. Thus, man exists in the world as a kinsman of the gods but strays through ignorance.⁵ He is

¹ Irenaeus tried to discredit gnostic tenets (e.g. those of Valentinus) by tracing their basic principles to certain comic poets and to certain philosophers (*Adv. H.*, II, 14). Historical research calls for an *honest* inquiry into possible contributory influences to the gnostic faith. Hence, the question of the moment is: Who or what influenced the writer of *Ev. Ver.* and how?

² Cf. W. J. Oates, *The Stoic and Epicurean Philosophers* (New York: Random House, 1940), p. xxii f.

³ "Discourses of Epictetus," Book I, chap. III (Oates, *ibid.*, p. 229).

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 295.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 269.

slow in understanding his own nature, slow in sensing his estrangement from God,¹ yet, through his innate powers of goodness, he can indeed realize the good life, i.e. a life in harmony with the universe.²

Greek anthropology, generally, is present in Epictetus' discourses. In particular, however, his anthropological emphasis is reflected in *Ev. Ver.* Like Epictetus, the writer of *Ev. Ver.* claims that men exist in the thought (νοῦς) of the Father and are joined to his thought even after they have come forth from him, i.e. appeared (37:5-10). It will be seen later that the theme of man's ignorance and error recurs throughout *Ev. Ver.* Yet, there is hope, though man is slow to understand his estrangement from God³ and his destiny of harmony or "oneness"⁴ found in the Father. This destiny means, of course, a fiery destruction of man's *hulic* nature (25:8-17).⁵

2. Platonic background. The writer of *Ev. Ver.* does not mention Plato but in several areas of thinking, he shows the influence of Plato's writings.

a. The idea of true revelation

In 23:3-18, the writer of *Ev. Ver.* contrasts two possible types of revelation⁶ which may conveniently be termed "outer" and "inner." Categorically he rejects outer revelation, that is, revelation in a book of consonants and vowels (23:3-7). To read such a book, he says, leads one to empty thoughts. True revelation is entirely different. It is a living book (22:38-39) containing letters of truth (ϥης ϥρεεῖς η̅ε̅ η̅τε̅ ϥαν̅τ̅αν̅η̅, 23:8-9), the Father's revelation in the hearts of his chosen ones (cf. 19:34-20:1; 23:14-16). To these references, 26:4-6 should be compared; "the Word which was in the heart of those who speak it." Here is to be found the true inner revelation. In contrast to an emphasis upon single sayings of Jesus which occur in the gospel of Thomas and the gospel of Philip, the writer of *Ev. Ver.* senses that true revelation

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 295.

² *Ibid.*, p. 269.

³ See, e.g. the parable of the drunkard (22:16-19)

⁴ See, e.g. 25:3-12.

⁵ Cf. the Stoics who adopted the view of Heraclitus to the effect that fire is the final principle. The Stoics believed that the various physical worlds are dissolved successively into fire (Oates, *ibid.*, p. xx).

⁶ The compound verb εϥφαν̅ε̅ α̅βα̅λ̅ "is manifested" appears in the context (23:2).

begins with the one God. The letters of this Divine book are written by Oneness (23:14-15). It is a revelation *in* his people that reveals the essential oneness of God. This means that if God is to be known, one must discover him through those whom he has called (cf. Eph. 3:10). Thus the writer of *Ev. Ver.* believes that revelation is found not in Scriptures but in the *nous* or in the mind of man.¹

The basic idea is not at all original with the writer of *Ev. Ver.* It reflects both a Stoic (see above) and a Platonic principle. Near the close of Plato's *Phaedrus*, Socrates extols the dialectical method but belittles the written word. The word in ink, he says, is weak for it always gives the same answer to the one who questions it. But the word of a better and more powerful nature, says the sage, is, "The word which is written with intelligence in the mind of the learner which is able to defend itself and knows to whom it should speak and before whom to be silent."²

To be sure, the Platonic idea undergoes change in *Ev. Ver.* The dialectical method is replaced by the Divine work of the Father. The connection, however, remains. Revelation (*Ev. Ver.*) or the living word (Plato) is not the word in ink but the word written in the mind of the learner (Plato) or "in the heart of those who speak it" (*Ev. Ver.* 26:5-6).

b. The idea of transcendent knowledge of truth

According to *Ev. Ver.*, the basic need of man is gnosis, gnosis of the unreality of all life apart from the Father, of the Father's nature, and of man's true origin and being in the Father. This gnosis, according to *Ev. Ver.*, is transcendent:

- (1) Because man lives in ignorance,³
- (2) Because he has forgotten his true being,⁴ and,
- (3) Because he acquires knowledge only as gnosis—from the outside—comes to him where he is, i.e. in Error.⁵

¹ In a somewhat similar fashion, the *Corpus Hermeticum* recognizes no inspired or infallible writings but stresses the Divine *nous* which enters man's mind and becomes identical or co-existent with it. Cf. W. Scott, *Hermetica*, I (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924), 7-8.

² "Phaedrus," 276A in the *Loeb Classical Library*, Plato, I, 567.

³ Cf. 17:9-14 where Ignorance of the Father is said to imprison man in a fog of Terror.

⁴ Cf. 18:7-9 where Forgetting (†*ḫwe*) arises because men do not know the Father. There is no neutral territory.

⁵ Cf. 18:4-5 where gnosis originates from the Father and 26:23-26 where it is said to draw near and to defeat Error.

The idea harks back to the theory of λήθη "forgetfulness," and ἀνάμνησις "recollection, remembrance," expounded in Plato's *Meno* (especially 81-86). As developed by Socrates, the theory says simply that the soul, being immortal, can remember all that it knew prior to its birth into the life that it now lives. According to N. Gulley, this Platonic process of ἀνάμνησις involves three stages—disillusionment with knowledge one has previously held, a recollection that certain propositions are true, and a comprehension of these recognized propositions in a coherent system.¹ Gulley feels that the introduction to the theory, i.e. the dialogue with the slave concerning a problem of mathematics, is very significant since mathematics is independent of life experience. This fact denotes for Plato the truth that there is existence "in us" independent of this life entirely,² and thus the theory "implies a distinction between the embodied soul and the soul *simpliciter*," as well as "a transcendent reality as the object both of true belief and of knowledge."³

In spite of the differences in the way in which transcendent knowledge is acquired in *Meno* (through the dialectical process) and in *Ev. Ver.* (through an existential encounter with the Father's gnosis), it seems rather obvious at this point also to discern some Platonic influence in the writer of *Ev. Ver.* The logical sequence of "events" whereby the knowledge of truth is acquired is essentially the same in both *Meno* and *Ev. Ver.*, i.e. γνῶσις—λήθη—ἀνάμνησις = γνῶσις in *Ev. Ver.*).

c. The idea of true existence or being

The extensive use in *Ev. Ver.* of the qual. form ὡοοι "to exist" (= εἶναι) and the infin. form ὡωπτε "to become" (= γενέσθαι) of the same Coptic verb, has a definite bearing on the author's idea of the nature of true existence.⁴ W. Till underlines the importance of distinguishing between these two Coptic forms which are never used indiscriminately in *Ev. Ver.*⁵ The writer of *Ev. Ver.*

¹ *Plato's Theory of Knowledge* (London: Methuen & Co Ltd., 1962), pp. 13-16.

² *Ibid.*, p. 18

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 18-19, cf. p. 22.

⁴ There are no fewer than 23 occurrences of the qualitative and 36 of the infinitive forms in the whole of *Ev. Ver.*

⁵ *Orientalia*, N.S., 27 (1958), 276. Grobel's translation of *Ev. Ver.*, among others, is marred by a failure to observe this distinction. Cf., e.g. 39:14-16 where he renders the three qual. forms by "become" or "becomes" (Grobel,

discovers that the basic pattern of gnostic existence or being is set by Jesus himself. In contrast to the Father who exists **πενυοον**, 28:13) but who has not become (**οτατωοπε**, "uncreated," 38:32), the Son who was existing (**πενυοον**, 39:22), *became* (**αψωοπε**)—a Guide (19:17), a Way, Gnosis, a Discovery . . . (31:28-35).¹ So too, like Jesus, Gnostics are those who, through having their existence (**σευοον**, 27:36)² in the Father, experience "becoming" (**υωοπε**). This becoming means being determined by outside forces. On the one hand these forces are those of Error which operate in a world of confusion and diversity (cf. 26:8 ff.), forces which all men experience in a very painful way (25:19-24). These forces aim to draw men away (17:33-36) from recognition of their true existence in the Father. But, on the other hand, there is the outside creative power of the Father's will exercised in behalf of his chosen ones (27:36-28:2; 37:21-24). Not to be subject to this power of the Father means to remain a-gnostic (27:30-33) and to reveal the lack of true existence in him (28:22-24). Contrariwise, to be receptive to the Father's will means to have the Divine nature within and to be brought (**υωοπε**) by Divine agency at the opportune time into the experience of spontaneous existence in the Father (cf. 27:36-28:5 including the brief parable on the **καιρος** "the opportune moment"). It means also that the Father's name comes to be (**υωοπε**) on the heads of the Gnostics (38:36-37)³ while they experience (**υωοπε**) joy in the discovery of the gnosis of the cross (18:28-29). Finally, it means that at the end, in the ideal state, in the Father's place, the Gnostics enter upon the meaning of true existence in the Father which once they possessed without knowing it (22:28-29). This destiny of the Gnostics means that

op. cit., p. 186). Similarly, the French, German, and English translations of the *Ev. Ver.* text of 39:14-16 err (pp. 41, 81, 107). Cf. also W. Isenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 153, who, when translating 28:22-24, fails to observe the shift from the qual. to the infin. form.

¹ The change from the qual. to the infin. form must indicate some change in the status of Jesus. Possibly the writer has in mind the passage in Phil. 2:5 ff. where Paul employs **ὑπάρχων** (v. 6) to mark out Jesus' pre-incarnate position, and later **γενόμενος** (v. 7) to show that at a specific time he definitely assumed human form. Thus the writer of *Ev. Ver.* indicates that, in order for Jesus to bring the Father's gnosis to his chosen ones, he had to exchange his "being" (**υοον**) for "becoming" = he had to come "into the midst" (19:19; 26:4-5) where he experienced, at least to a degree, what men experience.

² Cf. also 21:18-19; 28:11-12; 37:13-14; 39:15-16; 42:26-28; 43:10 f.

³ The Father's name bestowed in this way indicates Divine life or being.

the Father exists (ϣοοπ) in their midst without lack (43:7-8), and that they exist (ϣοοπ) in the life that is true (43:10-11) and find their rest (ⲕⲧⲁⲛ) in him (41:13-14, 29; 43:1).

It is quite clear that the over-all emphasis is Platonic. It is precisely the tension between Being and Becoming (or Sameness and Change) which concerns Plato to no small extent. The philosopher senses that it is impossible for the world of Becoming and Change to provide criteria of truth. On the other hand, to isolate the true world of Being and permanent Forms from the physical world can hardly have any basic significance for man living in the physical cosmos. F. Solmsen observes that an entire series of dialogues (e.g. *Theaetetus*, the *Sophist*, the *Statesman*, *Parmenides*) reveals the basic tension.¹ Out of the tension comes the recognition of a new idea, i.e. Being includes both Movement and Rest.² Thus, for example, in the *Sophist* (247 D-E), Being is defined as that which possesses power of any kind.³ That is, Being in its fullness implies Life, Movement, Soul, and Activity.⁴ Plato found the perfect pattern for the combination of Being and Becoming in the stellar universe. Here one could observe sameness and also orderly change, both of which presuppose the presence of Mind or *nous*.⁵ The problem remained, however, of a bridge between the world of Being and the world of Becoming. The *νοῦς* had its relation to the former but lacked the right contact with the world of flux and change.⁶

It is right at this boundary-line between Being and Becoming that Plato introduced his idea of the soul as the principle of life, and the source of all movement. In the *Timaeus*, it is the World Soul that occupies the scene while in the *Phaedrus* the individual human souls dominate the discussion. The relationship between the two types is not made clear though probably Plato regarded individual souls as parts of the World Soul, or, at least, of the same stuff.⁷

¹ *Plato's Theology* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1942), p. 77.

² *Ibid.*, p. 81. Cf. Logion 50 in the Coptic Gospel of Thomas where "Movement and Rest" form the answer to the question, "What is the sign of your Father in you?"

³ *The Loeb Classical Library, Plato*, II, 378-379.

⁴ Solmsen, *op. cit.*, p. 79.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 88.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 89.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 93.

Summary. The writer of *Ev. Ver.* makes no direct appeal to either philosopher or poet. His claim, however, that gnostics have come from the "thought" of the Father and that they are ultimately to find their "harmony" with the Father or in the Father is a basic anthropological idea of Stoicism (Epictetus). Moreover, in his concepts of revelation, knowledge, and true existence, the writer of *Ev. Ver.* evidences certain influence from Platonism. He lived in the wake of the recognition by Jesus of the tri-partite division of the Jewish Scriptures (Luke 24:44) and the formal recognition of the Old Testament canon by the synod of Jamnia (ca. A.D. 90). He wrote during a period when the authority of the New Testament gospels enjoyed a growing acceptance by the church as a whole. And yet, the only acknowledged revelation by the writer of *Ev. Ver.* is that revelation which is imbedded in the *nous* of the community of truth which community he represents. It is the prominence which he gives to the *nous* that relates him not only to Epictetus but to Plato. Similarly, it was seen above that there is a common concern for gnosis in both Plato and *Ev. Ver.* Whereas the idea of "faith" scarcely figures in *Ev. Ver.*,¹ both noun and verb formations of *καῖνε* "to know" (also *κοῖνω*) occur in great abundance. The writer is concerned with gnosis—transcendent gnosis—to which the man who is engulfed in ignorance has no access until the Divine awakening occurs (cf. e.g. 30:6-14). A similar idea was observed in Plato where Socrates insists on the twin ideas of his own ignorance and the recollection of a pre-incarnate knowledge. The closest relationship, however, between the writer of *Ev. Ver.* and Plato was found in the idea of true existence. The Gnostics believe that men have being or spontaneous existence in God. They are unaware of this, however, because of involvement in a world of becoming where Error holds sway. Their deliverance into the experience of being in the Father comes through the gnosis of the Father (cf. the Platonic World Soul) which Jesus mediates. They respond by virtue of the Divine nature within (cf. the *ψυχαι* of Plato), purge themselves of the *hulic* nature (cf. the way in which Socrates regarded the body as a hindrance), and ascend to the Father to possess their real existence in him (cf. the purgation of souls, according to Plato, by means of contemplating the heavenly bodies and the eternal Ideas).

¹ The verb *ᾤδτε* (*ᾤδοντ*) occurs in 20:7 only, the noun in 23:31-32 (possibly also in 34:28-29).

B. *The Writer's Relation to Christian Truth*

1. New Testament writings. There are indications throughout *Ev. Ver.* of the writer's familiarity with the New Testament.¹ He quotes no gospel passage nor does he refer to any New Testament writer by name, and yet, his indebtedness to New Testament truth is implied on every page of his work. He makes some allusion to the vast majority of these Christian books.² His familiarity with New Testament writings is evident in the way he weaves together in a mosaic-like form snatches of various passages. An example occurs in the single reference in *Ev. Ver.* to the resurrection of Jesus, a reference found in 20:28-34 where the text reads,

"He draws himself downward to death while being clothed with eternal life. He put off the rags of corruption. He put on Incorruptibility which no one can take from him."

The textual notes of *Ev. Ver.* refer to Phil. 2:8; 1 Cor. 15:53-54; 2 Cor. 5:2-4, and Col. 2:14-15, as the texts alluded to in this brief passage.³ It should have been added that the final clause is a clear echo of the first part of John 10:18 where Jesus says concerning his ψυχή, "No one takes it from me." Similarly the ideas of "putting off" and "putting on" show some affinity to Eph. 5:22-24 and Col. 3:9-10. Other examples of such a conflation of New Testament texts are found in 19:34-20:3; 30:30-35; 18:15-21.⁴

2. The New Testament preaching message. The writer of *Ev. Ver.* is no less familiar with the preaching message of the early church as it appears in the New Testament. He implicitly recognizes some of the important basic elements of the gospel such as, the incarnation of Jesus, his life and teaching, death, resurrection, and ascension. To be sure, the writer takes these kerygmatic

¹ With little qualification, it must be said that the Old Testament background in *Ev. Ver.* is exceedingly weak. In particular, *Ev. Ver.* lacks completely the setting of the Old Testament for the appearance of Jesus. Cf. W. C. van Unnik, *The Jung Codex*, p. 95.

² Allusions to the gospel of John are found in abundance. Cf. C. K. Barrett, "The Theological Vocabulary of the Fourth Gospel and the Gospel of Truth," *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962), pp. 210-223. To a considerable degree also, the writer of *Ev. Ver.* uses 1-2 Corinthians, Romans, Philippians, Matthew, Luke, Ephesians, Hebrews, 1 John, and Revelation. Other New Testament books are alluded to in a lesser degree.

³ P. 53.

⁴ Cf. van Unnik, "The 'Gospel of Truth' and the New Testament," *The Jung Codex*, pp. 108-111.

elements and re-interprets them and re-shapes them into a preaching message far different from the one which is the basic message of the early church. Yet, in agreement with van Unnik,¹ it can justifiably be claimed that *Ev. Ver.* is a gospel in that the writer attempts to relate a decisive action of God for man which transpires through the appearance of Jesus Christ.² This fact centers one's attention immediately upon the writer's relation to the Christian heritage or to Christian truth. The writer is certain of his remedy for the ills of mankind. To him, the Gospel of Truth is no "fifth" gospel to be added to the four of the New Testament.³ Rather, it is *the* gospel as over against all others.⁴ The gospel, he claims, carries with it the gnosis of the Father's true nature and of man's true origin and destiny in the Father. This is throughout the unifying theme of *Ev. Ver.*, a theme which makes its literary format so different from that of the other published "gospels" of the Nag Hammadi library (i.e. the gospel of Thomas and the gospel of Philip). The writer's presentation of the gospel is thus made with a great deal of assurance. At the same time he is no stranger to religious emotions. He is full of awe and amazement at his theme (e.g. 20:27-28; 22:27-30).⁵ Moreover, he claims that the gospel produces joy within the heart of man. This feature is sustained in *Ev. Ver.* from beginning to end.⁶

¹ *Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings* (Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1960), p. 67.

² The Christocentric character of *Ev. Ver.* will be noted in detail in chapter III, propos. II.

³ In agreement with van Unnik, "The 'Gospel of Truth' and the New Testament," *The Jung Codex*, p. 106, note 1, as against Puech-Quispel.

⁴ Paradoxically, the writer is opposed to books (23:3 ff.)—except for "the living book" (19:35-36)—and yet he himself writes a book, a book which claims to be "the gospel of Truth" (16:31). H. Jonas tries to avoid the paradox. In view of 23:3 ff., he suggests that the name of *Ev. Ver.* in its original Greek form was Περὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς Ἀληθείας, which name through a natural process became simply Τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον τῆς Ἀληθείας. That is, εὐαγγέλιον does not mean "literary document" as the present title in Coptic suggests, but "good news" as the presupposed original Greek title would suggest. Cf. H. Jonas, "Evangelium Veritatis," *Gnomon*, 32 (1959), 328 f. It would appear, however, that both things are true. The "Gospel of Truth" is good news; it is also a literary work in that from beginning to end it manifests "the gospel." Thus, the paradox remains.

⁵ To these references one should compare 17:7-8, 22; 18:31-32; 30:33-34, where the writer attempts to describe the indescribable Father.

⁶ The word "joy" is found in the opening sentence (cf. τελην in 16:31), is seen to be the fruit of the gnosis of the cross (ρεψε in 18:28-29), forms an

3. The cosmic realism of the New Testament. The parables of *Ev. Ver.*¹ probably reflect the writer's knowledge of the parabolic teaching in Jesus' ministry. They show at the same time, however, a depth to the writer's imagination. His detailed analysis of dreams (28:32-30:14) indicates, in addition, that he is a careful observer of the evil that engulfs men and the desperate need which men have for the gospel—the gospel as the writer understands it. One must admit that, in one sense, the writer takes evil in great seriousness. Evil, he says, is not mere appearance but a dreadful cosmic reality. Pl. 20:6-9 is only one illustration of many. In this text the writer cites the hopelessness of all men before the appearance of Jesus. The writer is not concerned with ethical behavior—good or bad—but with the total existential situation of men in the light of the gospel. Understood thus, an inevitable tension appears in *Ev. Ver.* between two factors. First, the writer believes that the gospel concerns the world at large. The "All" moves out from the Father (17:4-7) and must of necessity ascend up to him (21:8-11). This corresponds to the Johannine statement, πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο (John 1:3). Second, however, as the following pages will attempt to show, *the writer of Ev. Ver. is concerned with the chosen ones of the Father, those who have existence in him (27:36; 28:11-12), while at the same time he remains unconcerned for hūlic or material men who are and remain strangers to the gospel (31:1-4) and who have no essential being in the Father (28:22-24).* It can be said then that the writer of *Ev. Ver.* sees only a universe of predestined persons outside of whom there is no real being or existence. This corresponds to the way that the New Testament contrasts the cosmos with the redemptive work of God (cf. e.g. John 17:6, 14, 16; 1 John 2:15; 5:19) but, at the same time, fails to capture the paradox—the love of God for all men in the cosmos (e.g. John 3:16; 2 Pet. 3:9).

4. The authority of the New Testament. Like the writers of the New Testament—perhaps in imitation of them—the writer of *Ev. Ver.* speaks as one who knows. Implicitly he believes that he occupies a position of special authority over his readers, the community of truth. He appeals to no prophets or apostles other than

important part of the hymn concerning the Logos (23:24-26), figures in the parable of the good shepherd (32:3-4), and is an inner motivating factor with respect to the destiny of the chosen ones (43:16-18).

¹ Cf. chapter III, propos. II.

himself. By the use of the first person plural, the writer occasionally shows himself to be part of the community of truth (cf. e.g. 25:19-25; 27:34-35; 40:3-5). Quite often, however, he uses the second person plural, indicative mood as well as imperative, to indicate his knowledge of the nature of the congregation which he addresses (e.g. 32:22-24, 26 ff.), and/or his desire to make them responsible members (e.g. 17:28-29; 32:31, 35; 33:1-35).¹

Summary: The writer of *Ev. Ver.* is familiar with the New Testament writings, with the gospel and its cosmic realism, and with the authority of the New Testament. These things, however, are only preliminaries to his own production. His is a unique book (ΣΩΟΜΕ ΕΥΣΗΚ ΑΒΔΛ, 23:12-13).² There is no other type of literature to which it may be compared. It presents no system but bears witness to the gospel—what it means to the writer and what it can mean to others. On the whole, the writer does not engage in polemics against other works. *Ev. Ver.* shows throughout that its writer feels that he is above and beyond literary discussion. Perhaps this explains the puzzling feature that *Ev. Ver.* reveals only a minimum of Valentinian doctrines.³ The writer is content to describe what the gospel means to him—it is reality that is experienced.

II. JUSTIN MARTYR

In contrast to the writer of *Ev. Ver.*, Justin discloses not only his name but his identity with the Christian church. Moreover, he shows very clearly that both non-Christian writings and the writings of prophets and apostles have contributed to his understanding of truth.

A. Justin's Philosophical Background in Relation to his Idea of Truth.

Justin's writings reveal his conviction that a heritage of truth stems from the philosophers of ancient Greece. The Apologist

¹ The references in the first person singular strengthen the argument (e.g. 27:34-36; 42:40-43:2). The writer is conscious of his authority (cf. especially 42:40-43:8). He says that he has been in the place of rest (= he has entered the new life) and thus now is occupied all the time with the Father and with the true brothers.

² In this context the words refer primarily to "the living book" (= the Father's chosen ones or the Gnostics). A secondary sense, however, to *Ev. Ver.* itself, i.e. the writer's own production, is quite obvious.

³ The attempt of H. Jonas, "Evangelium Veritatis," *Gnomon*, 32 (1959), 334 f., to present *Ev. Ver.* as a condensed version of the Valentinian system as described by Irenaeus, is ingenious but unconvincing.

himself claimed to be a philosopher. In the meeting with Trypho, at the outset of his longest extant work, the Dialogue, Justin appears wearing the philosopher's mantle,¹ while he proceeds to show his deep respect for philosophy (D. 2:1-2) by making the following claims:

1. Philosophy is the greatest and most valuable possession before God (i.e. in the sight of God).
2. Philosophy alone introduces men to God.
3. Men who have turned their mind to philosophy are truly holy (ἅσιοι).²
4. Philosophy was sent down (by God) to men.³
5. Philosophy was originally one (D. 2:1) but became "many-headed" (πολύκρανος, D. 2:2).

The main emphasis of these statements is that philosophy is essentially the message of truth, that it proceeds from God to man, that it demands from man continuous and total commitment (cf. προσεσχέκναι in D. 2:1) and careful investigation (cf. ἐξετάσαι in D. 2:2), and that it introduces man to ultimate reality, i.e. God (D. 2:1).

The fact that truth is said to originate in God (κατεπέμφθη, "was sent down") shows that Justin speaks as a Christian. It is only when the one who is ultimate Truth and Reality makes himself known to man that man can investigate the Truth and know it. At this point, Justin does no more than suggest the way in which God has revealed the truth. He simply says, "It was sent down unto men" or "into men" (εἰς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, D. 2:1). Elsewhere he is more specific. In II. 8:1, for example, he states how the seed of the Logos is implanted in every race of men, making possible thereby a reception of Divine truth. The real problem which he faces

¹ Cf. the words τὸδε τὸ σχῆμα in D. 1:2 with a phrase in Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.*, IV. 11:8, ἐν φιλοσόφου σχήματι πρεσβεύων τὸν θεόν.

² Carolus de Otto, *Justini Philosophi et Martyris Opera* (Jena: Prostat in Libraria Hermanni Dufft, 1876), Vol. I, Part II, 6, note 2, rejects both an earlier (A.D. 1565) apparent reading ἑλβιοι in Langius' Latin translation (*felices*), and the conjectured reading of σοφοί in Maranus' edition (1742). Otto interprets Justin's meaning in the light of D. 8:1 where the Apologist affirms Christianity to be the only safe and profitable philosophy. It is reasonable to think, however, that in D. 2:1, "philosophy" is used in a general sense; in D. 8:1, it is specific, meaning Christian doctrine. The adjective ἅσιοι constitutes no problem. Just as the Apologist can call Heraclitus and Socrates χριστιανοί (I. 46:3), so, in general, he can describe those who devote themselves to philosophy as ἅσιοι.

³ A similar statement is made in *de Resurrectione*, I. 1.

in D. 2 is why philosophy, originally one, just as Truth is one,¹ became many-headed, i.e. why there are Platonists, Stoics, Peripatetics, Theoretics,² and Pythagoreans (D. 2:1). In posing the problem, Justin shows no less than any philosopher of his day, a basic concern with the quest for a central principle of oneness amid diversity. His own answer to the problem is simply—perhaps too simply—given. He says that illustrious teachers who investigated philosophy seriously were succeeded by those who investigated nothing concerning the truth (οἱ ἔπειτα μηδὲν ἐξετάσαντες ἀληθείας περί, D. 2:2), being content merely to receive and transmit the truth which their esteemed teachers taught. Justin's answer is not altogether clear. At what point in time did truth or philosophy become "many-headed?" It will be noted below that Justin claimed a special philosophical kinship with Socrates and Plato. Chronologically, however, Heraclitus (ca. 540-475 B.C.) and Pythagoras (fl. 530 B.C.), to whom Justin shows deference, preceded Socrates (ca. 470-399 B.C.) and Plato (ca. 428-347) by almost a century. Thus, in view of the fact that for Justin, Plato and his master were no mere traditionalists but creators of philosophical thought, one may ask, did they simply add two more "heads" to the already-diversified philosophical field of inquiry? Whatever may be the Apologist's answer to this question, one thing is certain, i.e. his sense of obligation to some of the Greek sages in view of the truth which he found to be in them.

First, however, there were philosophers whose claim of true doctrine Justin rejected outright, among them Epicurus and the Cynics. In II. 7:3, he contrasts the persecuted and martyred Socrates to the happy and peaceful Epicurus about whom the evil demons were never worried. In II. 12:5, he criticizes severely the shameless immoral teachings of Epicurus, while in II. 15:3, he simply states that Christian doctrines are at variance with those of the Epicureans. No less forthrightly does Justin reject the Cynic philosophy which gained a new influence in the first and second Christian centuries.³ Justin's reference to the school

¹ Otto, *ibid.*, 7, note 4, compares the statement of the emperor Julian in Oration VI, ὥσπερ γὰρ ἀλήθεια μία, οὕτω δὲ καὶ φιλοσοφία μία. cf. "Julian" II, *The Loeb Classical Library*, p. 14.

² Otto, *ibid.*, p. 7, note 3, thinks Justin means Skeptics or Pyrrhonists.

³ E. de Faye, "L'influence du Timée de Platon sur la Théologie de Justin Martyr," *Bibliothèque de l'École des hautes Études, Sciences Religieuses*, VII (1896), 171.

is brief but revealing. In II. 3:1 ff., he speaks frankly of his anticipated persecution by a certain Crescens, one full of bias against the Christians. He is not a φιλόσοφος, says Justin, but a φιλόδοξος "glory-lover," or "opinion-lover" (i.e. lover of the opinions of others). And, with a clear reference to Crescens, Justin concludes, "It is impossible for a Cynic, one who sets himself forth as indifferent [ἀδιάφορος] with respect to his goal [τὸ τέλος], to know good except indifference" (II. 3:7). In brief, Justin affirms that just as there are Christians unworthy of the name they bear, so there are philosophers who bear the name and wear the mantle and yet are unworthy of their profession (I. 4:8-9). It is to this class that Justin relegates both Epicureans and Cynics.

Second, there were philosophers with whose doctrine Justin was in basic agreement. With some, his agreement was partial, with others (Socrates and Plato), almost complete.

1. Pythagoras. The references Justin makes to the sixth century philosopher or to his school are brief and reveal little more than a basic regard for the philosopher and the truth which he taught.¹ In D. 2:4, in recounting his spiritual pilgrimage, the Apologist tells of a brief encounter with a celebrated Pythagorean philosopher. He anticipated help from him thinking that the man had much to offer. He lingers over the account of his rebuff by the philosopher's questions, "Are you acquainted, with music, and astronomy, and geometry," to all of which Justin confessed his ignorance. Whereupon the philosopher dismissed Justin seeing he was ill-prepared for the Pythagorean doctrine.

2. Heraclitus. The two references to Heraclitus (I. 46:3; II. 8:1), the other sixth century philosopher whom the Apologist mentions, are brief but positive. In view of the pantheistic leanings of this early sage, it is quite striking that Justin calls him a Christian. Heraclitus held to two main ideas which the Stoics later adopted—the primal element of fire and the cosmic reasoning power or λόγος.²

3. The Stoics. Unlike his attitude toward Heraclitus, Justin questions the idea of truth held by the Stoics. Admittedly, he says, the Stoic moral teachings are admirable (II. 8:1) and their idea of the end of the cosmos approximates Christian eschatological

¹ Cf. I. 18:5; D. 2:1, 4; 5:6; 6:1.

² Cf. E. R. Goodenough, *The Theology of Justin Martyr* (Jena: Verlag Frommannsche Buchhandlung, 1923), pp. 2-3.

teaching (I. 20:4). At this point, however, Justin's recognition of any truth in Stoicism ends. He categorically denies their doctrine of fate (εἰμαρμένη) as well as their pantheistic outlook which fails to make a clear distinction between God and his creation (cf. II. 7:3-4, 8; I. 20:2). Moreover, his description of their doctrine in D. 1:4 is completely negative.¹ He says that:

- a. They are unconcerned whether there is one God or many.
- b. They are unconcerned whether or not God cares for men.
- c. They believe that God has nothing to do with human happiness.
- d. They believe that God cares for the cosmos, not for individuals.
- e. They entertain no dread of punishment, no hope of reward.
- f. They believe that nothing changes for the better or for the worse.

Despite the detailed information, Goodenough believes that Justin's knowledge of Stoicism is a man-in-the-street, conversational acquaintance. In particular, he thinks that Justin has erroneously classed Heraclitus with the Stoics and confused (cf. Apol. I. 20:1) the Stoic theology and cosmology.² To the contrary, Gildersleeve claims that Heraclitus was "the spiritual ancestor of the Stoics."³ F. Ueberweg expressed this view in a more definite way, "The Stoics in their philosophy of nature and in their theology, reproduced the doctrine of Heraclitus."⁴ With reference to Stoic cosmology, one wonders if Goodenough's evaluation of Justin is made on the basis of a "normative Stoicism" and thus fails to allow for any flexibility. Otto points out, for example, that Panaetius of Rhodes (180-111 B.C.) introduced a change in Stoic doctrine by abandoning the doctrine of the destruction of the world by fire.⁵ Since Stoic theological speculation did not distinguish between God and the cosmos, there is certainly some point to Justin's argument in I. 20:1.

4. Socrates and Plato. Among the philosophers who represent a source of truth, these two sages stand first in Justin's estimation. In I. 5:3, the syntactical combination of the dative of means,

¹ There is general agreement that by οἱ πλεῖστοι in D. 1:4, the writer refers to the Stoics. Cf. Otto, *op. cit.*, vol. I, part II, 4, and G. Archambault, Justin, *Dialogue avec Tryphon* (1909), I, 6.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 61.

³ B. L. Gildersleeve, *The Apologies of Justin Martyr* (1877), p. 221.

⁴ *History of Philosophy*, transl. from 4th Germ. ed. (1872-4), I, 42.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, vol. I, part I, 63, cf. also Ueberweg, *op. cit.*, I, 189.

λόγῳ ἀληθεῖ, and the imperfect tense of πειρᾶν indicate Justin's conviction that the whole life of Socrates was given over to an attempt by means of the true Logos to expose the false activity of demons and to lead men away from their control. Justin sees mirrored in Socrates the pattern of bold witness (II. 3:6) and patient suffering which true Christians experience (II. 7:3; 10:5). But beyond this, he believes that Socrates represents a pre-Christian Christian, even though he be considered a pagan (I. 46:3; II. 10:8). With Socrates, says Justin, truth always comes first (II. 3:6).

Some attention needs to be paid to the references in Justin's writings to Plato's works. These references are of two kinds—quotations and allusions. E. de Faye claims that there are about forty such textual citations or allusions in the two Apologies and the Dialogue, but he gives no listing nor other information as to how he arrived at this figure.¹ Whatever the total figure, Justin's use of Plato is evidently confined to a few works. De Faye believes the Apologist shows familiarity with the *Apology*, *Crito*, *Phaedrus*, *Phaedo*, *Republic*, and especially, with the *Timaeus*.² Goodenough is more cautious, eliminating the *Crito* and the *Phaedrus* from de Faye's list.³ This limited use may mean, as both de Faye⁴ and Goodenough⁵ are quick to point out, that Justin's knowledge of Platonism was neither profound nor complete. At the same time it needs to be remembered that Justin writes as a Christian Apologist, choosing and using those Platonic teachings which will best serve his purpose.⁶ This point is borne out by the discovery that, apart from two references (both from the *Republic*), all of the Platonic texts in Justin appear in connection with specific Christian teaching.⁷ The two exceptions are found in I. 3:3 and II. 3:6.

¹ "L'Influence du Timée de Platon sur la Théologie de Justin Martyr," *Bibliothèque de l'École des hautes Études, Sciences Rel.*, VII (1896), 172.

² *Ibid.*, p. 177.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 62.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 177.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. 61-62.

⁶ Cf. Goodenough, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

⁷ De Faye's claim ("L'Influence du Timée de Platon sur la Théologie de Justin Martyr," *Bibliothèque de l'École des hautes Études, Sc. Rel.*, VII [1896], 176) that Justin's use of Plato, following the pattern of thought in the second Christian century, is heavily weighted on the ethical side and that his references show little concern with the other two divisions of philosophy—Logic and Physics—is true as far as it goes. The claim, however, needs the balance of Justin's Christian conviction out of which he writes.

In the first exception (I. 3:2-4), Justin makes a general appeal for a fair judgment as Christian life and teaching (βίος καὶ λόγος) are presented. To substantiate his appeal he cites the general maxim in the *Republic* (V, 473 D-E), "Unless the rulers and those being ruled become philosophers,¹ states cannot become prosperous." That is, the Roman rulers will do well to take the path of practical expediency and give a fair hearing to Christianity before pronouncing judgment.

The second exception (II. 3:6) is set in the context of Justin's strong denunciation of Crescens and the Cynic school of philosophy which Crescens represents. He fails, says Justin, to regard the Socratic saying, "Truth must be honored before man" (the *Republic*, X, 595 C). By means of his statement Socrates shows that, in spite of his respect from childhood for the poet Homer, he must regard truth first and foremost. It is not so with Crescens. That Cynic is possessed by a blind, slavish obedience to the masters of his school. The truth means nothing to him.

The references to Plato in Justin's works which are related to specific Christian doctrine.

a. God. In II. 10:4-8, the writer observes that Socrates, when accused of introducing new divinities (cf. Plato's *Apology*, 24 B), used to urge (πρὸςτρέπετο) men on toward the full knowledge of the unknown God by saying, "To find the Father and Demiurge of all is not easy, neither is it safe having found him to declare him unto all." The quotation comes from the *Timaeus*, 38 C, and it should be noticed first, that, according to the *Timaeus*, the statement was made not by Socrates but by Timaeus, and second, the quotation is quite free in form having one difference especially noteworthy. Justin substitutes the adjective, "safe" (ἀσφαλές) for the adjective, "impossible" (ἀδύνατον), which is found in the text of the *Timaeus*. But apart from these differences, the appeal of Justin is clear. Socrates' attempt to declare God to men, at best, met with partial success since he experienced a limited operation only, of the Logos. But Christ, the full Logos, has done what Socrates could not do, i.e. make the Father known. So successfully has Christ done this that men of all positions in life have been won over to him—even at the price of death.

¹ Gildersleeve, *op. cit.*, p. 110, thinks that the form φιλοσοφήσωσι is an ingressive aorist.

D. 4:1 contains another reference to the nature of God in Plato.¹ God is said to be something beyond all substance (ὄν ἐπέκεινα πάσης οὐσίας, D. 4:1). This is, however, the "unconverted" Justin who speaks. His view forthwith changes under the influence of the old man.

b. The Holy Spirit. In describing the Holy Spirit or the third person of the Godhead (I. 60:7), the Apologist uses an obscure portion of Plato's *Second Epistle* (312 E). Justin's text (τὰ δὲ τρίτα περὶ τὸν τρίτον) reverses the singular and plural in the text of Plato (= καὶ τρίτον πέρι [sic!] τὰ τρίτα).² In view of the enigmatic character of this passage from Plato,³ it can merely be said that Justin somehow assumed the third Principle of Plato to be a borrowing from Gen. 1:2.

c. Creation. Justin makes no fewer than four references to Platonic texts (all from the *Timaeus*) in support of the Divine origin of the universe.⁴ To understand the Apologist's references at this point it is important to see the controlling principles in the *Timaeus* (especially 27 C-29 D). Those principles are:

(1) The eternal is intelligible; what comes to be is the sensible.

(2) Whatever comes to be must have a cause.

(3) The work of a maker is good only if he fashions it after an eternal model.

(4) What the maker forms comes from a formless, invisible substratum (cf. especially the *Timaeus*, 50 E-51 A) similar to formless clay before it is molded.

(5) Whatever comes to be is corruptible, yet the maker wills to sustain what he creates.

The references in Justin show that, while he refers to no eternal model of creation, he does subscribe to principles (2), (4), and (5), as noted above. His very language approaches that of Plato as he affirms that God worked on ἄμορφος ὕλη, "formless matter" (I. 10:2; 59:1), and that he wrought a change in τὸ σκότος καὶ ἡ ὕλη, "darkness and matter" (I. 67:8). Like the *Timaeus* (29 E), Justin ascribes the work of creation to the bounty of God (I. 10:1). Justin has, however, the Christian addition; creation is for the sake of man (I. 10:2).

¹ The reference apparently is to the *Phaedo*, 65 E—66 A, and/or to the *Republic*, VI, 509 B.

² *The Loeb Classical Library, Plato*, VII, 410.

³ Cf. the discussion in *The Loeb Classical Library, ibid.*, 400-401.

⁴ I. 10:2; 59:1; 67:8; D. 5:4.

d. The cross. In I. 60:1, Justin quotes loosely a passage from the *Timaeus* (36 B-C) portraying the $\chi\tilde{\iota}$ which the Demiurge places in the cosmos. The $\chi\tilde{\iota}$ is none other than the World Soul which forms the bridge between the two worlds—Being and Becoming. Justin's words are, "And the matter treated physiologically in the *Timaeus* from Plato concerns the Son of God, when it says, 'He made him a $\chi\tilde{\iota}$ in the All'." At first, Justin thinks that the World Soul of Plato is a borrowing from Moses who affirmed that the Son of God partakes of two worlds. How does the Son do this? In answer, Justin's thought shifts from the Son to the cross. The shift is significant and forms an effective sequel to his exposition in I. 55 on the $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma$ of the cross.¹ The $\chi\tilde{\iota}$ now viewed as the cross is seen to partake of two worlds—the world of death as evident in the people of Israel dying from the deadly serpents, and the world of life as seen in the deliverance of the people who in faith looked to the figure of the cross (= the brass serpent) which Moses erected at God's bidding (cf. Num. 21:8-9).

e. Man.

(1) His free will. In I. 43-44, Justin defends with vigor man's responsibility before God since man possesses innate freedom of choice. The ability to choose has been inherent in man from the beginning (I. 44:1). Thus, Justin affirms that the oft-quoted line from the *Republic* (X, 617 E), "The blame is the one who chooses; God is free from blame," was gleaned by Plato from Moses.²

(2) The destiny of evil men. In I. 8:4, Justin affirms that the punishment to be meted out to the wicked, is the same as that which Plato predicted (*Republic* X 615 A; *Phaedrus* 249 A). He adds, however, that Christians believe that Christ will do this and that the punishment will be of unlimited duration.

These then are the quotations from Plato and the less ambiguous allusions to his works which Justin employs. E. R. Goodenough,³ and R. E. Witt,⁴ both point out that Justin's Platonic views are very close to those of the middle Platonist Albinus who flourished during the first half of the second Christian century. Middle Platonism was a time marked by the weakening of the original

¹ Cf. chap. III, propos. III for a further treatment of I. 60.

² Cf. Deut. 30:15, 19 with Apol. I. 44:8.

³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 21-32.

⁴ *Albinus and the History of Middle Platonism* (Cambridge: University Press, 1937), p. 144.

creative thought of Plato. The change may be seen in three distinct ways:

1. First, it was the era of skepticism in the Academy, particularly epitomized in Carneades (ca. 214-129 B.C.). Carneades' basic theory stated that knowledge was impossible. Beyond this base, however, he advanced the two-pronged theory of suspended judgment (*ἐποχή*) and degrees of probability.¹

2. Second, it was the era of commentaries and introductions both to Plato and to Aristotle. That is, the anti-dogmatism and anti-conformity so essential to the Platonic and Aristotelian schools gave way to the teaching of transmitted doctrine.²

3. Third, it was an era of syncretism. Goodenough comments, "The teaching in the Academy at that time was by no means fixed, and the amount of Stoicism and Aristotelianism intermixed into the Platonic substrate would vary widely with the different teachers."³

Albinus is no skeptic but he fitly combines the second and third ideas of his day (as given above). He was a Platonic commentator as witnessed by his introduction to the Dialogues of Plato. He was also an instructor in Platonic doctrine and synthesizer of those doctrines and those of the other main schools of his time, as witnessed by his second main work called the *Didascalicus* or *Épitomé*.⁴ Thus Albinus' purpose is to declare the Platonic doctrines to students and the listening public. Where Albinus' teaching shows mixture from Aristotle and others, it means that he sees in the borrowed material a continuation of the Platonic teaching.⁵ The interpretative and synthesizing work of Albinus and its reflection in Justin appears in the idea of ultimate Truth, i.e. God. God is one and incomprehensible (*ἄρρητος*),⁶ *ἄρρητος* being the same term for which Justin shows a predilection.⁷ God,

¹ M. M. Patrick, *The Greek Sceptics* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1929), pp. 153-173.

² René Le Corre, "Le prologue d'Albinus" in *Revue Philosophique*, 146, 1 (1956), 28-38.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 21.

⁴ For the text of this work, cf. Pierre Louis, *Albinos Épitomé* (Paris: Les belles Lettres, 1945).

⁵ Cf. R. E. Witt, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

⁶ *Épitomé*, X, 4.

⁷ Cf. the pleonasm of I. 61:10-11 where the writer insists on the namelessness of God as well as the unutterableness of his name. Cf. also chap. III, propos. I.

says Albinus, is comprehensible by the mind alone, an idea which is substantially the same as D. 4:1 expresses. At the same time God is the origin of all truth as the sun is the origin of all light (ἀλήθεια δὲ διότι πάσης ἀληθείας ἀρχὴ ὑπάρχει ὡς ὁ ἥλιος παντὸς φωτός).¹ The description comes very close to *de Resurrectione*, I. 1² which reads Λόγος δὲ ἀληθείας ἀπὸ θεοῦ πέμπεται. But the affirmation is even closer to D. 121:2, where the text of Goodspeed reads, πυρωδέστερος γὰρ αὐτοῦ ὁ τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ σοφίας λόγος καὶ φωτεινότερος μᾶλλον τῶν ἡλίου δυνάμεων ἐστι, καὶ εἰς τὰ βάθη τῆς καρδίας καὶ τοῦ νοῦ εἰσδύνων,³ "For his word of truth and wisdom is more aflame and more light-giving than the rays of the sun, even sinking down into the depths of the heart and the mind." All of the elements in Albinus' idea of God are here; (a) God, the origin of all truth, (b) God, the one comprehensible to the *nous* alone, and (c) God, the one who is like to the penetrating power of the sun.⁴

Summary: Justin's idea of truth is affected by his philosophical background to which both he and his writings bear witness. His two acknowledged masters were Socrates and Plato. Internal evidence reveals that the Platonic philosophy was mediated to him through the philosophical thought represented by the middle Platonist, Albinus. Justin's particular debt to Plato is found in the field of ethics, a debt which is apparent not only in the Platonic quotations and allusions but also in the wide appeal Justin makes in his works to ethical standards of truth (cf., e.g. I. 3:1; 5:3; 43:6; 53:12; 56:3; II. 3:5-6; 4:4; D. 24:2 et al.).

B. Justin's Christian Background in Relation to his Idea of Truth

At the beginning of his First Apology, Justin claims to belong to the Christians (εἰς αὐτῶν ὢν, I. 1:1). He ascribes his Christian conversion to two factors. In the Second Apology (12:1-2), he cites briefly the irreproachable life of Christians and their disdain of persecution as direct influences in his conversion. He says that though he was at one time rejoicing (χαίρων) in the teachings

¹ *Épitomé*, X, 3.

² Written possibly by Justin or one of his followers.

³ *Die ältesten Apologeten*, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1914), p. 240.

⁴ Albinus' idea of God in his *Épitomé* (chap. X) contains other features that are paralleled in Justin. One example is the term "the first God," a term implied in Justin by his frequent reference in the Dialogue to Christ as "second God."

of Plato, he was led to examine the claims of Christianity only to find that Christian teachings alone were true and that all other doctrines were of demonic origin. In the Dialogue, however, he describes his Christian conversion at length (D. 1-8). He states that he visited various schools of philosophy finding at last that the school of Platonism was the most satisfactory of all. But, through an old man, a Christian whom Justin met by the sea, the philosopher was led to the truth of Christianity which, he said, was the only safe and profitable philosophy (D. 8:1). Goodenough has declared that the two accounts (II. 12:1-2 and D. 1-8) are in no way at variance. He writes,

"There is here no fundamental contradiction between the Apology and the Dialogue, even taking the passage in the Dialogue as a record of Justin's actual experiences. It may well have been that just at the time when his attention was called to the Christians by some remarkable instance of Christian fortitude during a persecution, he was in a state of discouragement at the discovery of new teachings in Platonism which he had found difficult to understand." ¹

The account in the Dialogue has been taken as true,² as ideal and fictitious,³ and as authentic but not without fictitious elements.⁴ G. Misch describes Justin's report as the first Christian account of conversion to be put in "conversion-form," a form of writing which was current in the Hellenistic world of culture of Justin's time.⁵ Goodenough cites the remarkable parallel to Justin's experience in Lucian's *Menippus*, which R. W. O. Helm first noted.⁶ A similar experience is described by the Tannaim, cited by H. Goldfahn.⁷ A. D. Nock finds two elements mirrored in Justin's autobiography; a literary commonplace, and the attitude of the time, an attitude fostered by the confusion of widespread and accessible, yet divergent, philosophical ideas.⁸

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 72.

² James Donaldson, *A Critical History of Christian Literature and Doctrine*, II (London: Macmillan and Co., 1866), 63.

³ E. R. Goodenough, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

⁴ J. Rivière, *Saint Justin et les Apologistes du second siècle* (Paris: Librairie Bland et Cie, 1907), pp. 129, 131.

⁵ *Geschichte der Autobiographie* (Leipzig und Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1907), pp. 295-296.

⁶ *Lucian und Menipp* (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1906), pp. 40 ff.

⁷ *Justin Martyr und die Agada* (Breslau: Verlag von H. Stutsch, n. d.). pp. 1 ff.

⁸ *Conversion, the Old and the New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933), p. 256.

The account of Justin is clothed in a vivid style of grammar. In D. 2:6-3:1, a succession of verbs in the imperfect tense¹ underscores the habitual life Justin was living as a Platonist, while the ingressive aorist ἀνήφθη in D. 8:1 points to the beginning of the new life in Christ. Without doubt the colloquy with the old man by the sea assumes a special meaning.²

The structure of the colloquy revolves around one main question, "How can man know the Ultimate Truth, i.e. God?" The wrong answer (given by Justin) is, "by the power of the *nous*." The true answer (given by the old man) is, "by the power of the Holy Spirit who gives illumination into the words which the prophets wrote concerning Christ." Other questions arise in the colloquy only as they bear on this main question of knowing God.

In the introduction to the heart of the conversation, Justin claims that philosophy is the most valuable occupation of man because it is concerned with God (D. 3:4-4:1). In his argument, Justin represents God in three ways:

(1) He is that which is, and the True (D. 3:4).³

(2) He is that which always maintains the same nature and way, and the cause of all other things (D. 3:5).⁴

(3) He is that something which the νοῦς of man can perceive, and which comes suddenly into souls which have a basic kinship (συγγενές) with It and a desire to see It (D. 4:1).

¹ Thus συνδιέτριβον, "I used to spend time with," προέκοπτον, "I was progressing," ἐπεδίδουν, "I was improving," ἤρει "(the perception of incorporeal things) continued to grip (me exceedingly)," ἀνεπτέρου, "(the contemplation of forms) was furnishing (me) with wings," ὤμην, "I was supposing (that I had become wise)," ἤλπιζον, "I was hoping"—all in D. 2:6 while ἐπορεύομην, "I used to go (to a certain field)," occurs in 3:1.

² Cf. the spiritual autobiography of Paul in Gal. 1:13-19. A series of three verbs in the imperfect tense (ἐδίωκον, ἐπόρθουν, and προέκοπτον, vs. 13-14) depict his daily life in Judaism as an enemy of Christ, while another series of verbs (13 in number), all except one in the aorist tense, points to the decisive nature of the change which God wrought in him (cf. vs. 15-19).

³ Goodenough, *op. cit.*, pp. 63-64, senses that Justin's full statement, φιλοσοφία . . . ἐπιστήμη . . . τοῦ ὄντος καὶ . . . ἀληθ. ἐπίγν., differs significantly from Plato. "Justin is in this section obviously drawing in general upon conceptions to be found in the *Phaedo*, yet Plato in the *Phaedo* speaks of τὰ ὄντα, Justin of τὸ ὄν. The change is not an insignificant one, for τὰ ὄντα meant to Plato a scientific field of inquiry, while τὸ ὄν to Justin meant simply God" (*ibid.*).

⁴ This statement shows the influence of Albinus who represents God as both ἀκίνητος νοῦς and effective Cause of all things in the physical world. Cf. the *Épitomé*, X-XI (P. Louis, *op. cit.*, p. 133). Albinus in turn reflects Aristotle's definition, "the unmoved Mover."

Justin's definition—especially the third part—does not go unchallenged. He has implied that man can know God through philosophers who have seen him and heard him, and through the natural kinship which souls have with him. The old man proceeds to question both implications. He denies to any man (philosophers included) the possibility of knowing God through the *nous*, if that *nous* is "unadorned" (μὴ . . . κεκοσμημένος) by the Holy Spirit (D. 4:1). Moreover, he denies the soul's kinship with God and proceeds to correct Justin's idea of the soul. The soul, says the old man, is not immortal but begotten just as the world is begotten (D. 5:1-2). It will not, however, die but live on in a better or in a worse place (D. 5:3). It lives not because it is life but because it shares in life. Moreover, it is wholly different from that of which it partakes (D. 6). At this point, as Justin is in despair of knowing any truth at all (D. 7:1), the old man introduces him to the Hebrew prophets, and, through the prophets, to Christ. It is through Christ that the answer to the question on Ultimate Truth or God can be given. At the conclusion of the old man's final speech, Justin records that, "a fire was kindled in (my) soul" (πῦρ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ ἀνήφθη), and then he proceeds to affirm that love for the prophets and for the friends of Christ took hold of him (D. 8:1). Here, he says, is the true philosophy (D. 8:1), and for this reason, he adds, "I am a philosopher" (D. 8:2).

Summary: Whether the conversion account be viewed as genuine or not, its significance for the present purpose is found in the way it places Justin before his readers as a Christian. Especially does the final speech ascribed to the old man (D. 7) indicate unequivocally the conviction of the Apologist relative to Christian truth. The following summary will serve to demonstrate the point.

1. Christian truth has the advantage of antiquity (D. 7:1). The prophets preceded the philosophers: Moses preceded Plato. In the First Apology as well as the Dialogue, the emphasis recurs (cf., e.g. I. 59:1; 60:1). Because Christian truth is older, the discovery of parallels to it in the writings of philosophers means either that the truth was imitated by them, or, as the case of Socrates shows, that the Logos was at work in them just as he was among the Old Testament saints.

2. Christian truth originates from the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit made it possible for the prophet to see the vision of God and to hear the voice of God and to put the truth which

he saw and heard into written form. It is noteworthy that "the prophetic Spirit" becomes *the* title by which Justin refers to the Holy Spirit in all of the Apologist's works. The emphasis is Christian in that it shows revelation to be a Divine work. At least a trace of Hellenism, however, may be present in the clause "see and hear." To see the truth with the eye of the *nous* was at once the aim and goal of Greek philosophy. Justin expresses the idea well in D. 2:6, "I was hoping directly to behold [κατόψεσθαι] God, for this (is) the goal [τέλος] of Plato's philosophy." Biblical revelation has another emphasis. Although they speak of "seeing God" (e.g. Exod. 24:10; Job 42:5-6, though cf. Exod. 33:20), Biblical authors indicate that the vision is not related to an inherent power of the *nous* but to God's presence or glory, for example, that filled the tabernacle (Exod. 40:34) and the temple (1 Kings 8:10), and especially to God's presence in Jesus Christ (John 14:9).

3. Christian truth is to be found in the Old Testament. The prophets, says the old man, were trustworthy witnesses of the truth which is above all demonstration (D. 7:2). The fact marks the basic reason for the extensive and consistent use the Apologist makes of the Old Testament. "Not your Scriptures but ours, for we are won over to them," is his avowed claim to the Jew Trypho (D. 29:2).

4. Christian truth concerns Divine events which have turned out (ἀποβάντα) and continue to turn out (ἀποβαίνοντα) just as the prophets, by means of the prophetic Spirit, predicted (D. 7:2). It will be observed subsequently¹ that the prophecy-fulfillment stress is a most important part of Justin's First Apology and of his Dialogue with Trypho.

5. Christian truth concerns God and Christ his Son (D. 7:3). It is the total impact of Christian truth as the old man expounds it and as Justin receives illumination into it, that effects the marked change in his life. Accordingly, when Justin states (D. 8:2), οὕτως δὴ καὶ διὰ ταῦτα φιλόσοφος ἐγώ, he probably denotes what has transpired as recorded in D. 7:1-8:1—the climactic speech of the old man and Justin's own spiritual awakening. Thus φιλόσοφος in D. 8:2 means basically, *Christian* philosopher. Justin, the former Platonic philosopher has become Justin the Christian philosopher.

¹ Cf. chapter III, propos. II.

CHAPTER THREE

A COMPARISON OF *EVANGELIUM VERITATIS* WITH THE WRITINGS OF JUSTIN MARTYR IN RELATION TO THE NATURE OF TRUTH

This chapter aims to demonstrate in detail what truth means in *Ev. Ver.* and in the writings of Justin Martyr. To perform the task the works of the two men are compared through a series of propositions pertaining to truth, the truth concerning God and his world (propos. I), concerning Jesus Christ as the Logos of the Father (propos. II), concerning the earthly life, death, and resurrection of Christ (propos. III), concerning man and his appropriation of truth (propos. IV), and concerning the community of truth (as each writer understands it)—its origin, life, and destiny (propos. V). As a conclusion to the discussion of each proposition, a summary and a comparison of the ideas of the two writers appear.

PROPOSITION I

The writings of Justin and *Ev. Ver.* understand truth to be inherent in an incomprehensible God. Both view truth as cosmic in scope. They differ sharply, however, in their understanding of the manifestation of truth; in Justin's writings, truth is manifested in the realm of Divinely-ordered events; in *Ev. Ver.*, truth is largely manifested in a metaphysical realm known as "the middle."

A. Truth is inherent in an incomprehensible God

1. According to Justin. Justin affirms that God is both the true (ἀληθινός) and the most true (ἀληθέστατος) God (I. 53:6; 6:1). This means that amid the confusion and multiplicity of human existence, the Apologist's concern, no less than that of any philosopher of his day and earlier, was with a central principle of truth. This, he found, in the transcendent God. Justin has no doubt about God's transcendence. He calls him ἄρρητος, "unutterable" (I. 9:3; 61:11; II. 10:8; 12:4; 13:4; D. 126:2; 127:2, 4). In one sense, as Goodenough observes,¹ the term denies the Stoic idea

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 133.

of the immanent God; in another sense, it expresses Justin's idea of "the immense chasm between God and humanity".¹ The word is common in sacred inscriptions and often is associated with the mysteries.² The one occurrence of the word in the New Testament (2 Cor. 12:4) is in the neuter plural and refers to the unutterable words which Paul heard during his experience in the third heaven. Justin's use of the word shows that man cannot know God by means of conceptual thinking.³ In I. 61:11, Justin's language is especially strong. "For no one can ascribe [εἰπεῖν] a name to the ineffable God [τῷ ἀρρήτῳ θεῷ]; but if anyone should dare to say that there is [i.e. a name to him] he has raved the reckless raving." The fact, however, does not lead Justin into agnosticism since he discovers (e.g. D. 29:3; 127:4) that the inexpressible God manifests himself in the world which he has made. The fact that Christ is named in close connection with the "inexpressible God" (II. 13:4; D. 126:2; 127:4) points to the way out of the human dilemma. The Father is ineffable, yet Christ is his *dunamis* or *logos* to express the one who cannot be expressed. That is, the ineffable (ἄρρητος) Father, the origin (ἀρχή) of truth, can be known through the various manifestations (δυνάμεις) of truth.

2. According to *Ev. Ver.* The writer of *Ev. Ver.* is certain that God is "the Father of truth" (ἈΠΩΤ ΠΤΕ ΤΛΗΕ), i.e. the source from whom all truth issues (16:33). The two alpha privative adjectives, ΠΑΤΩΑΠῆ ΠΑΤΛΕΕΕ ΑΡΑΥ, "the Infinite, Incomprehensible One" (17:7-8, cf. 17:22-23; 18:31-32; 30:33-34) are closely parallel in thought to Justin's term ἄρρητος. God can be confined within no limits. He surpasses all human thought. The idea is amplified in the final words of the prologue of *Ev. Ver.* (17:8-9), ΠΕΕΙ ΕΤΕΑΤῆ ΑΛΕΥ ΗΛΛ. The verb ΕΑΤῆ is qualitative in form and hence, the clause is to be rendered, "the one who remains chosen over against every thought [of men]." The incomprehensible character of God is especially lucid in 22:31-33, "Since they were unable to comprehend and know the one in whom they were." By way of comparison we find that Irenaeus describes

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

² Cf. J. H. Moulton, George Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1952), p. 79a.

³ Cf. O. A. Piper, "The Nature of the Gospel according to Justin Martyr," *JR*, XLI, 3 (July, 1961), p. 156.

the Valentinian idea of God in *Adv. H.*, I. 1:1, *esse autem illum invisibilem, et quem nulla res capere possit*. For the Latin, the Greek text of Epiphanius reads, ὑπάρχοντα δ' αὐτὸν ἀχώρητον καὶ ἀόρατον.¹ As in Justin's work, so the incomprehensibility of the Father in *Ev. Ver.* does not lead to despair. In the parable of 19:10-17, the writer insists that the Father's desire is to be known and loved. The same idea is present in the prologue where the writer affirms that grace (ῥᾱτ) is given to enable men to know the Father of truth (16:32 f.). The climax of grace appears in the manifestation of the Father of truth. There is no indication here of the intricate system of emanations such as Irenaeus ascribed to the Valentinians,² but there is indication of the experience of truth in human existence.

B. Truth is cosmic in scope

1. According to Justin. Justin believes that since God, the origin of all that is, is true, then that which issues from him will reflect his truth. Thus Justin insists that the most true God is also the God of all that is. There are more than sixty-five references in the Apologies and the Dialogue to God as the Father or maker of all. The various texts show that Justin almost invariably couples the title πατήρ τῶν πάντων (or π. τῶν ὅλων), "Father of the all", with some other title of deity. Among his references, there are found no fewer than eleven different constructions to express the cosmic idea. By far the most common expressions are ὁ ποιητὴς τῶν πάντων (23 times) and ὁ πάντων πατήρ (23 times). The expressions convey the idea that God, though he be ineffable, made the truth about himself known in what he has made. The apparent cosmic scope of truth, however, must be qualified. There is, according to Justin, an empirical existence which man has in himself (*Ev. Ver.* categorically denies this, as will be seen). That is, there are two elements of truth, according to Justin—objective and subjective. There are absolute criteria by which all things can be judged. Thus, truly pious men as well as philosophers live κατὰ ἀλήθειαν (I. 2:1) even as they honor and love the thing that alone is true

¹ Cf. W. W. Harvey, *op. cit.*, I, 8. The description of God by negative terms was a widespread feature in pagan philosophical writings, in folk religion, in gnostic writings, and in Christian works. Compare S. Arai, *Die Christologie des Evangelium Veritatis*. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964), p. 33.

² According to the description found in *Adv. H.*, I. 1:1, in the original tradition of the Valentinian system, Truth is both the offspring of the Father (= Bythos) as well as the feminine element in the syzygy Nous-Aletheia.

(τἀληθές, I. 2:1). Being what they are, the Apologies challenge the rulers to conduct their examination of Christians in accord with true principles (I. 3:1; 12:6, 11; 14:4, etc.). With reference to the prefect, Crescens, from whom Justin expects persecution and perhaps, death, the Apologist quotes the words of Socrates in the Tenth Book of Plato's *Republic*, "Truth must be preferred before men" (II. 3:6). That is, Justin insists that truth must be upheld in the judgment of Christians—not prejudice or mere opinion or false charges. Justin sets up truth as a standard over against ignorance (I. 12:11), evil (I. 2:1), customs and opinion (I. 12:6; 53:12; II. 2:11), and error (I. 56:3). In the Dialogue, the writer frequently uses the adjectival form "true" to describe the new life in Christ as opposed to the old economy of Israel. Thus it is that one reads of the true fast (D. 15:1), the true circumcision (D. 18:2; 41:4), true repentance (D. 107:2), the true teaching (D. 35:2), the true Sabbath (D. 12:3). Likewise, Justin affirms the subjective emphasis in truth. He says that Christians are true (I. 53:3; II. 2:11), that they are the true Israel (D. 11:5; 135:3), and the true high-priestly race (D. 116:3). In general, he believes that seeds of truth are in all men (I. 44:10).

2. According to *Ev. Ver.* The cosmic element of truth appears more forceful in *Ev. Ver.* than in Justin. The Father, according to *Ev. Ver.*, is not only the Father of truth (16:33, cf. "the truly good one" in 42:30), but "Father of the all" (πῶτ ἅπτηρῃ, 20:19, cf. 43:4-5). The occurrences of τῆρ as an anarthrous adjective are of no immediate concern. The form, however, of the adjective with the article and the third masculine singular suffix (20 occurrences) is important. The fact that πτῆρῃ can be used with either a singular (18:35) or plural (17:5) verb is not unnatural.¹ It constitutes a kind of inverse phenomenon to Greek where the neuter plural noun may take either a singular or plural verb. Sometimes the word appears to be limited in extent or elective in force. Thus the parable of the deed of inheritance (20:18 ff.), with its emphasis on the hidden All that becomes manifest by reason of the death of Jesus, points to a select group. That is, the hidden All is the οὐσία (20:16), those who have substance or existence. In contrast to these, the writer finds that there are those who have no existence (39:11 ff.). Thus

¹ Cf. Till, *Orientalia*, N.S., 27 (1958), 271.

"the All" of 20:18 is similar—*mutatis mutandis*—to "all Israel" of Rom. 11:26. Therefore the term in *Ev. Ver.* often refers to a particular group of beings who represent the whole though not being the sum total. A second use of ⲡⲧⲏⲣⲉ̅, however, means "the All" in the sense of all-inclusive. The form occurs a number of times in the Coptic versions of the Bible in the sense of "creation" or "created things" (e.g. Job 8:3^{sa}, Rom. 11:36^{sa.bo}, 1 Cor. 8:6^{sa.f}, Job 25:2^{sa}, Gen. 49:25^{sa}, John 1:3^{sa} (^{ms}), Wisdom of Sol. 1:7^{sa.bo}, cf. *Crum*, 424a). The second meaning is undoubtedly the prevailing one in *Ev. Ver.* Thus the expression "Father of the all" (20:19; 43:4-5) means that the Father is the generator of all that is, all creation. The writer also affirms that the Father made the all (19:7-8) and is responsible for the foundation of the all (20:1-2).¹ The text of 17:6-9 is even more precise. It describes the All as being in the inner part of the infinite, incomprehensible, Father. That is, all things that exist partake of Divine life. Perhaps even more significant is the text of 24:4 ff., whose context has to do with the work of Jesus among the All. He takes the form of the presence of the All and purifies them. The word ⲙⲟⲩⲏⲧ̅ (*Crum*, 175a) means "a thing made, formation," or "something hand-made" (cf. the Sahidic version of Rom. 9:20; Deut. 31:11; 29:15 and especially 2 Cor. 5:1 where the alpha privative form occurs for the Greek word meaning "not hand-made"). Thus the All which the Father made is now in some sense purified by Jesus and thereby reflects the Father. Look at the All and you will see the Father. The writer senses that the truth of the Father is to be found in what he has made although that truth remained indistinct until the purifying work of Jesus. The idea suggests a counterpart to the truth of Rom. 1:20, "Ever since the creation of the world his invisible nature, namely, his eternal power and deity, has been clearly perceived in the things that have been made" (RSV). A similar idea to *Ev. Ver.* 24:4 ff. is to be found in the Gospel of Thomas, Logia 67, 77.²

C. Truth has become manifest.

The terminology of Justin and of the writer of *Ev. Ver.* is quite

¹ The Coptic text is damaged at the beginning of both 20:1 and 20:2. However, the restoration suggested by the editors of the *Ev. Ver.* text is without doubt correct.

² Cf. the discussion of Log. 77 by B. Gärtner, *The Theology of the Gospel According to Thomas* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1961), pp. 144-147.

similar. Justin seldom uses the verb ἀποκαλύπτειν or the noun ἀποκάλυψις. If one deletes the references in Justin to these words in quotation of Scripture, little trace of the words remains. On the other hand, the verbs φανεροῦν and φαίνειν and their congeners figure in an important way. The situation in *Ev. Ver.* is the same. There is only one occurrence of the verb ὤλπ “to reveal” (24:9) and one only of the noun ὤλπ “revelation” (27:6). On the other hand, the verb ὄωηρ ἄδαλ “to manifest” and its corresponding noun form occur with great frequency and place a strong accent on the Divine element. According to *Ev. Ver.*, the gospel (17:2-3), the Son (27:7; 30:24-25; 30:32; 20:22-25 *et al.*), the Father (18:13; 27:5), the Gnostics (19:34-36; 22:38-23:2 *et al.*) are all part of the Divine manifestation. In 17:36-37, the verb ὄωηρ ἄδαλ is associated with Error. Perhaps in this text also, however, the Divine element is to be understood and the passage to be read, “Error’s Forgetting was not a [Divine] manifestation.”¹ The important conclusion, apparently, is that the writings of Justin and *Ev. Ver.* show something of their relationship to the Hellenistic world of ideas. In its prevailing religious sense, ἀποκαλύπτειν emphasizes the supernatural action of God’s character and purpose in the world of human affairs.² It is much more related to an early Jewish-Christian base. But the verb φανεροῦν and congeners is more closely tied to Hellenistic Christianity.³ The New Testament gospels show that while ἀποκαλύπτειν is frequently found in the Synoptics, with the exception of Mark 4:22 (but not so the parallels) φανεροῦν is absent. On the other hand, the gospel of John (also 1 John) uses φανεροῦν and congeners profusely while ἀποκαλύπτειν is never found (John 12:38 is in a quotation). There is a fairly even distribution between the words in the Pauline letters. In both the Sahidic and Bohairic versions of the New Testament, ἀποκαλύπτειν- ἀποκάλυψις is almost invariably rendered by ὤλπ (Bo. ὤρπ) and φανεροῦν and congeners by ὄωηρ ἄδαλ. This evidence from the vocabulary of the New Testament is indication of the common terminological bond between Justin and the writer of *Ev. Ver.* in depicting the Divine manifestation of truth. However,

¹ Cf. K. Grobel, *op. cit.*, p. 49, note 47.

² Cf. C. F. D. Moule, “Revelation,” *IDB*, IV (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), 56-57.

³ A. Oepke in *TWNT*, 3 (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938), καλύπτω, κάλυμμα, ἀνα-, κατα-, ἀποκαλύπτω, ἀποκάλυψις, 558-597, but cf. especially 594-595.

their understanding of how truth is manifested differs sharply.

1. According to Justin. Justin finds that truth is manifested in the realm of Divinely-ordered historical events. At the beginning of his apodictic emphasis in his First Apology (23:1), Justin states that the truth of his argument depends on the historical Christ and the prophets who preceded him. The participle μαθόντες (I. 23:1) should be given a strong causal sense so that the sentence may read, "Because we have learned from Christ and the prophets who preceded him, as many things as we say are true" (ἀληθῆ). By the adjective μόνα Justin shows the exclusive element of truth. That is, the human dilemma can never be solved without reference to the Hebrew prophets or to the historical appearance of Jesus Christ. That other solutions to this dilemma have been tried is not denied. Justin senses, however, that these attempts are the abortive and deceptive work of demons (I. 14:1; 21:6), attempts which were made both after the prophets had spoken (I. 54; 62:1-4; 64) and after Christ had come (I. 26; 56-58). The Apologist claims thus that to seek a solution of problems apart from Christ and the prophets is impossible. Like the text of I. 23:1, I. 43:2 connects the participle μαθόντες to the adjective ἀληθές, "Since we have learned through the prophets we declare as true..." The use of "the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets" (I. 67:3; cf. 66:3) in corporate Christian worship serves to illustrate Justin's basic belief that truth is ultimately rooted in history. It makes little difference, therefore, whether ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων and/or εὐαγγέλια are viewed as synonymous with the New Testament gospels¹ or not.²

A similar approach to the understanding of truth is present in the Dialogue. In a sense, Justin's task in the Dialogue is easier. He shares with Trypho a heritage of faith in the same God (D. 11:1) and in the same Old Testament Scriptures (D. 29:2), a kinship lacking entirely in the First Apology where the writer's argument is directed to the pagan Roman rulers and people. Moreover, the fact that Trypho has carefully read the precepts "in the so-named gospel" and is amazed at their excellence, and that he is at a loss to explain the ethical behavior of Christians (D. 10:2), provides

¹ Thus H. Köster, "Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern," *Texte und Untersuchungen*, 65 (1957), 11-12.

² Thus J. Leipoldt, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1907), I. 129 f., and O. A. Piper, *JR*, XLI, 3 (1961), 155, 166.

Justin with a strong base for his Dialogue. So, following the account of his conversion (D. 1-9), Justin's Dialogue from beginning to end has a sustained orientation to the historic Christ as the true fulfillment in time of the Old Testament prophecies.

The Second Apology reveals a slightly different base for understanding the manifestation of truth. The historical coming of Christ is accepted no less than in the First Apology and the Dialogue (cf. II. 6:5). But in place of the Old Testament prophets, truth is said to be rooted in the ancient sages, especially in Socrates (II. 3:6; 7:3; 10:5, 8). As will be observed later (i.e. propos. IV), the idea of "inner truth" is closely linked to Justin's belief in the sowing of seeds of truth in all men (I. 44:10) = "the spermatic Logos" (II. 8:3; cf. 13:5).

In brief, Justin finds the basis of truth in history, i.e. in the historical promise—explicit in the prophets (Apol. I and Dialogue), implicit in the sages (Apol. II)—and in the historical coming of Jesus Christ. The prophets have prophesied, says Justin, before the events have transpired. In view of the fact that the predicted events have subsequently occurred (γενόμενα) and are yet occurring (γινόμενα), the rulers (I. 30:1) and Trypho (cf. D. 53:1-2; 133:1) thereby have at hand the greatest and truest (ἀληθεστάτη) evidence for the Christian faith. The aorist participle, γενόμενα refers to events that surround the birth, life and ministry, passion and resurrection of Jesus, while the present participle, γινόμενα (cf. I. 30:1; D. 35:8) refers to events occurring in Justin's own time such as the spread of the Christian message to all lands (D. 42:1; I. 40:7) and the exorcism of demons by Christians (II. 6:6). To the aorist and present participles of γίγνεσθαι, Justin adds the future participle (I. 52:4; D. 49:3 et al.) as indicating events yet to occur in accord with the prophetic word. Truth in history, therefore, according to Justin, means that there are seeds of truth in all men (I. 44:10), that the dynamic of truth can put ignorance to flight (I. 12:11), that it encounters men everywhere (II. 15:4), meeting them where they are and challenging them to recognize truth (D. 96:2; 110:6), since truth is clearly manifest.

2. According to *Ev. Ver.* Truth, according to *Ev. Ver.*, becomes manifest on its own peculiar scene of "history" quite distinct from the type of history which Justin records. The sense of historical truth is as much absent from *Ev. Ver.* as it is present in the writings of the Apologist. *Ev. Ver.* does show a sense of movement in space

or time. There is, for example, in *Ev. Ver.* a movement out from the Father (cf. the movement of the Word, 16:34 f., of the universe, 17:5 f., of Truth, 26:27 f., and, in general, the frequent occurrence of the clause $\epsilon\iota\ \alpha\delta\alpha\lambda$, "to go forth"). Likewise there is movement toward the Father (cf., e.g. 22:7-9). Moreover, mention of the school (= synagogue?) where Jesus taught (19:18-20), of the Sabbath day (32:18, 23-24), and, of the cross (20:27, cf. also, "He was nailed to wood" in 18:24; 20:25) are all indications of space and/or time, that is, intimations of historical events. Apart from these few indications, however, and apart from the Deity and a single reference to the Devil (33:20), *Ev. Ver.* contains no names of persons or places or of Christian institutions. The very search which the reader of *Ev. Ver.* must make to find any historical ties shows that the basic manifestation of truth, according to this document, does not occur in history. Sir Edwyn Hoskyns once said of the Fourth Gospel, that its theme is the non-historical that makes sense of history.¹ In *Ev. Ver.*, the theme is also non-historical, but the lack of historical anchors in the document makes its basic theme elusive. Nevertheless, *Ev. Ver.* does have a scene of "history" where truth is manifested. Truth, according to *Ev. Ver.*, appears "in the midst" or "in the middle" ($\alpha\tau\alpha\mu\tau\epsilon$). The word $\mu\tau\epsilon$ occurs seven times in the document. In 43:8, the reference is to the gnostic fellowship in which ($\rho\eta\tau\omicron\tau\alpha\mu\tau\epsilon$) there is no Lack of the Father. In 36:14-15, the reference points also to this fellowship, i.e. those who recognized the light that was in Christ when he was in their midst ($\rho\eta\tau\omicron\tau\alpha\mu\tau\epsilon$). Each of the five remaining references, however, points to the "scene of action" in which the truth of the Father's redemption appears. In four of these five references the construction is $\epsilon(1)\ \alpha\tau\alpha\mu\tau\epsilon$, "to come into the midst" (i.e. "Jesus" in 19:19, "that book" in 20:8-9, "the Word" in 26:4-5, and "Truth" in 26:27-28). It seems quite certain from 17:33-36 that the term represents basically some kind of metaphysical arena where the redemption drama is portrayed. The particular construction in 17:34-35, $\bar{\eta}\eta\tau\alpha\mu\tau\epsilon$, means "those belonging to the middle." The text describes the endeavor of "Error" ($\pi\lambda\alpha\mu\eta$) to "draw forth those of the middle and to take them captive." The idea of "the middle" appears also in Irenaeus' works. He says that the Valentinians distinguish

¹ *The Fourth Gospel*, ed. F. N. Davey (London: Faber, 1940), p. 129.

three types of men, the *pneumatikoi* "the spiritual ones," the *psychikoi* "the soulish ones," and the *hulikoi* "the material ones." The *psychikoi* belong to the middle, that is, midway between the spiritual and the material.¹ As for the destiny of these three classes, the *hulic* men go into corruption, the *psychikoi*, if they make the true choice, find their rest in an intermediate place,² while the *pneumatikoi*, by reason of the spiritual substance within them, ascend into the *pleroma* and are bestowed as brides on the angels who attend the Savior.³ The three-fold division and three-fold destination of men varies slightly from *Ev. Ver. Ev. Ver.* refers to an unfortunate destiny in Hades (42:17-18) and to the Father's paradise of rest (36:36-39), but it does not mention an intermediate position. The "middle" in *Ev. Ver.* is rather the meta-physical plane where the realities of Truth and Error meet. It is the realm of human experience. The experience, to be sure, occurs in the cosmos which is the natural "mid-point" between the Father's *τοπος* and Hades. Nevertheless, a cosmos of time and place is not the writer's primary concern. When he asserts that, "Truth came into the middle" (26:27-28), he affirms that Truth is active in that very place where Error seeks to draw men down into the prison of the material world (17:33-36). The verb *ωρα*, "to draw, attract," is used in 17:34 of Error, but in 32:12, it is used indirectly of the Father.

Summary and Comparison

Both Justin and the writer of *Ev. Ver.* believe that truth originates with an incomprehensible God, and that truth is manifested. The very terminology of the writers is similar. Moreover, each writer affirms that truth embraces the cosmos. God is the Father of all that is (cf. *Apol. I.* 61:10; *Ev. Ver.* 17:4 ff.). The claim suggests that in some way—in the cosmos—the truth of God becomes manifest. For Justin, the manifestation of truth is found in history, especially in the historical coming of Jesus Christ. He believes that the objective event contains the key to the truth of human existence. The discerning man (ὁ νοουεχής), he says, will comprehend God's truth from the presentation and explanation of the events associated with the history of Jesus—from his birth

¹ *Adv. H.*, I. 7, 5 (Harvey, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 64-66).

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

through his ascension. Justin, however, qualifies this objective emphasis by indicating that seeds of truth are to be found in all men. *Ev. Ver.*, on the other hand, denies any universal element to truth. Furthermore, *Ev. Ver.* lacks the historical anchors which are so vital to Justin's works. In *Ev. Ver.*, the event is not important. What is important is the existential situation of man who experiences "in the middle" the reality of Error and Truth—each with its own attraction, each attempting to elicit a favorable decision from man.

PROPOSITION II

In the writings of Justin (First Apology and Dialogue)¹ and in *Ev. Ver.*, the idea of truth focuses on Jesus Christ. In both writers Jesus is viewed as the Father's Logos. In the writings of Justin, truth is essentially a Divine process in which the Father's Logos functions in creation, in the history of God's people, and in the Old Testament prophets. In *Ev. Ver.*, truth is a human experience in which, through the Father's Logos, man finds gnosis for his ignorance, completeness for his lack.

A. The idea of truth focuses on Jesus Christ

I. According to Justin

a. The First Apology. Justin opens the Apology with a defense of Christians by affirming that they deserve a fair trial just as much as any man (I. 1-14). Undoubtedly one of the central points in his argument pertains to the name Χριστιανοί (I. 4:5). Christians exist because of Jesus Christ, the one who, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, is the object of Christian worship (I. 6), the one whose kingdom is not of this world and whom Christians cannot deny (I. 11), and the one who has brought Christians out of an old life in paganism into a new life with God (I. 14). Both by positive citation of Christ's teaching (I. 15-17) and analogies to it (I. 18-22), Justin sustains his Christocentric emphasis. In I. 23-60, the Apologist observes that it is the nature of Christ (to a lesser degree, his work) which is important to Christian doctrine. His argument concentrates on the prophecies concerning the Son of God who became incarnate for the sake of mankind (I. 30-53), whose person

¹ The Second Apology has for its main subject the persecution of Christians and how Christians react to it.

and work have been counterfeited by demons (I. 54-58) and imitated by Plato and the mythmakers (I. 59-60). His argument states that some prophecies have come to pass, others are in process of fulfillment (cf. *γενόμενα* and *γινόμενα*, I. 30:1). The writer considers prophecy to be "the greatest and truest proof" (*μεγίστη κ. ἀληθεστάτη ἀπόδειξις*, I. 30:1). Everything centers on Christ, whether the prophets who proclaimed him beforehand or the apostles who proclaimed him after he had come. Likewise Justin's explanation of Christian worship (I. 61-67) focuses on Christ, whether it be the eucharist which he instituted (I. 66) or the worship service on the Lord's day, the day he arose from the dead (I. 67).

b. The Dialogue. The Dialogue opens with an account of Justin's conversion (D. 1-9), the main point of which is to show how the prophets alone saw and proclaimed the truth (D. 7:1). As the old man tells how the prophets both glorified God the Creator and proclaimed his Son (D. 7:3), a fire is kindled in Justin's soul inspiring him with love for the prophets and for the friends of Christ (D. 8:1). Beginning with D. 10, Justin's argument centers on Jesus Christ from the standpoint of both the Old Testament law and the prophets. From the perspective of the law, Justin affirms two main ideas:

(1) The Old Testament law is abrogated by the new law which is Christ (D. 11:4), and,

(2) The Old Testament law through its types anticipates the coming of Christ (cf. especially D. 40-43).

In a much longer section on the prophets, Justin lays stress on the advents of Christ (D. 32-54), a point to which he later returns (D. 111-114, 138-139). Within the framework of the two advents, Justin's argument from the prophets turns first on who Christ is. He is prophesied as *second God* (D. 55-62, cf. also 125-129), as *incarnate* (D. 63-78), as *suffering on the cross* (D. 86, 89-105), and as *raised from the dead* (D. 106-108). Second, his argument cites evidence of what Christ has done. The origin of Christians is due to him, a fact which the Old Testament foretold (D. 109-110, 114-124) just as it foretold also the faithfulness of Christians in sharp contrast to Jewish unbelief (D. 130-135). The Dialogue closes with a plea to accept the Christ of God (D. 136-137) in view of the free will which God has bestowed on all men (D. 140-141).

Thus, the Dialogue has a definite structure which focuses on

Jesus Christ by pointing up the essential Christ-centered nature of the Old Testament in its two main sections—law (D. 10-31) and prophets (D. 32-141). To be sure, there is interpenetration. Thus, for example, in the section on the old covenant of the law (D. 11), Justin inevitably turns to a prophet, Jeremiah (31:31 f.), for his proof that a new law and covenant have abrogated the old. Or again, in his section on the prophets and their stress on the two advents of Christ (D. 32-54), the writer has a lengthy argument (D. 40-47) where he finds that the first advent means the end of the law for all who believe in Christ. Nevertheless, throughout the Dialogue, the Apologist concentrates his attention on Jesus, affirming that he who was prophesied has come in exact fulfillment of the prophecies made concerning him.

2. According to *Ev. Ver.*

In *Ev. Ver.*, as in the writings of Justin, truth concerns the person and work of Jesus Christ. In the prologue, the Word (= Jesus Christ) appears as the means by which the gospel of truth comes to men (16:33-35). Likewise in 18:15-21, Christ is the channel of the good news. Accepting Till's punctuation,¹ the text may be rendered:

"It is through Jesus the Christ that this hidden mystery dawned upon those who were in darkness by virtue of the work of Forgetting. It [i.e. the gospel] dawned upon them. It provided a way, and this way is (the) Truth of which it [i.e. the gospel] informed them."

No attempt is made in the passage to define the precise way in which the person and work of Jesus appear. It is to be observed, however, that in the mind of the writer of *Ev. Ver.*, the revelation of the mystery of the gospel of truth is inextricably linked with Jesus Christ. In 18:21-19:17, the writer depicts the plot of Error, the enemy of Truth, to bring Jesus to the cross. It is through the cross, however, that Jesus becomes the Father's gnosis to all who discover him. In 19:17-24:21, attention centers on Jesus who appears "in the midst," takes the living book of the living ones and suffers for it, thereby making possible the response of the fellowship of truth to the Divine call. The crowning part of this section (23:18-33), on the basis of both its content and context, appears

¹ *Orientalia*, N.S., 27 (1958), 272.

to be a hymn of praise concerning the Father's Word, Jesus. In 24:21-25:25, Jesus is probably the true subject, the one who "served" in the *schema* of Lack (= the world), a world which ceases to be when the Father is known. In 25:25-27:9, the writer claims that the coming of Jesus effects a purifying judgment and that his incarnation brings division among men. His coming is synonymous with the coming of gnosis and Truth. Jesus' work forms a basis for the description of the Father's gift to his own (27:9-33), and of true existence which is found in the Father (27:34-28:32). The work of the Holy Spirit in behalf of the community (30:14-32) has for its express goal the manifestation of the Son. He allows men to lay hold of the Son, who himself accomplishes a work for the true believers by becoming a Way for the straying, Gnosis for the ignorant, a Discovery for seeking ones, Strength for shaking ones, Undefilement for defiled ones (30:32-31:35). The closest tie which *Ev. Ver.* has to the New Testament lies in the parable of Jesus the shepherd (31:35-32:30) which forms the basis for the "ethical" section that follows (32:31-33:32). The section on the Father's aroma (33:33-35:23) contains no explicit mention of Jesus. Nevertheless, in view of the evident allusions to anointings in the New Testament passages where Jesus is prominent (Mark 14:3-9; 2 Cor. 2:14-16), and in view of the application beginning with 34:34 ("This is the Logos of the good news of the discovery of the *pleroma*"), the writer implies that the Father's aroma is linked firmly to Jesus. In the light of previous references to the noun *σινε* "discovery" (17:3; 18:29; 31:31), it is quite possible that both in the word *λογος* (34:35) and in the word *σινε* (34:36), some indication is present of Jesus' important role in this description of the fortune of the Father's aroma in the world. The section on the Father's fullness made available to the one who lacks (35:24-36:13) directs one's attention to the parable of the physician (= Jesus) who supplies what the patient lacks.¹ According to 36:15-35, the anointing of the chosen ones comes through Christ. The anointing preserves those vessels that are his, as plantings in his paradise (36:25-37:3). Moreover, Christ is the Father's Word who, according to the Father's will, came forth first and revealed the Father's words and *nous* (37:4-18).

¹ Cf. the fact that the same word *καειν* "physician" figures in Logion 31 of the Gospel of Thomas which gospel also re-interprets the work of Jesus as physician.

The coming of the Son is dependent on the Father's will (37:19-38:6) and the Father's true name is his Son. That is, the Son is the true revelation of the Father (38:6-40:29). *Ev. Ver.* closes with a description of the Father's place and of those who come to be there (40:30-43:24). Even here, however, the centrality of Jesus is retained since not only is he described as coming forth from the place (40:30-31), but as bringing men to the place (41:5-12).

Summary and Comparison

R. P. Casey has observed that the underlying concern of the Valentinians was with Christology and Soteriology.¹ An evidence of this concern appears in the system of Theodotus.² Superficially at least (as shown above), a similar interest emerges from a study of *Ev. Ver.*,³ where Jesus is apparently the foundation upon which *Ev. Ver.* rests. The words "superficially" and "apparently,"⁴ however, inject an important qualification. The question is, how serious must one take a Christology or Soteriology that is not nailed down to history? It will be seen subsequently that *Ev. Ver.* de-precates or de-mythologizes the historical appearance of Jesus. This means that what the writer says about Christ stands in a setting that is generally quite foreign to the context of the New Testament. The writer shows himself to be fully independent of the apostolic witness and of the church. He cannot then be "Christ-centered" in the strict sense of the word. It is precisely at this point that the "Christ-centered" works of Justin differ. Justin lives within the traditional frame of reference—the church. He identifies himself with the church (cf. I. 1, εἰς αὐτῶν ὧν). His thought pattern moves within the framework of the church. The Christ about whom Justin writes is the Christ of history and the Lord of the church.

¹ *The Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria, Studies and Documents*, I (1934), 37.

² *Ibid.*

³ K. Grobel, *op. cit.*, p. 51, note 57, observes that in all five occurrences, the names "Jesus" (20:11, 24; 24:8), "the Christ" (36:14), and "Jesus the Christ" (18:16), appear each time at the beginning of a line of the Coptic text. This suggests an artificial device on the part of the writer to enhance the place or importance of Jesus.

⁴ Cf. the compound verb *στῶν ἐν ᾧ* "to appear." His appearance, however was "in the middle," a phrase which marks an important terminological difference from "was manifest in flesh" (1 Tim. 3:16).

B. *The idea of truth pertains to the work of the Father's Logos*

1. According to Justin. In the writings of Justin, truth is essentially a Divine process in which the Father's Logos functions—in creation, in the history of God's people, and in the Old Testament prophets.

Introduction. The term λόγος is an important one for Justin's writings. Occasionally it has the general meaning of "discourse" or "discussion" or "account" (e.g. D. 65:7; 9:2; 55:1; 66:1; 68:3; 116:1; I. 17:4; 59:1; II. 1:1; 12:6; 15:2). In the Dialogue, the singular form appears with great frequency to denote the Old Testament Scriptures. The formula which Justin uses varies between "the word" (e.g. D. 49:2; 56:4, 5; 57:2; 68:5; 93:3; 102:4, etc.), "the word of the prophet" or "the word of the prophecy" or "the prophetic word" (e.g. D. 30:2; 56:6; 77:2; 85:4; 110:3; 128:4), and "the word of God" (e.g. D. 58:4; 62:1; 141:2). In the Apologies, however, apart from its meaning "discussion" (as noted above), the singular form λόγος almost always refers *either* to "the reason" (= the spermatic Logos) which God has placed in man's *nous* (e.g. I. 2:1; 3:1; 5:2; 32:8; II. 8:1, 3; 9:2, 4; 10:2), *or* to the pre-incarnate or incarnate Christ (I. 10:6; 21:1; 22:2; 23:2; 32:10; 63:4, 10, 15; II. 9:4; 10:1, 3, 8; 13:4). There are only two references in the Apologies where λόγος refers to the Old Testament Scriptures (I. 53:6; 61:9). In I. 53:6, the writer speaks of Jews and Samaritans who have (ἐχοντες) the word from God that has been handed down through the prophets. In I. 61:9, the writer applies a λόγος in Isa. 1:16-20 to Christian baptism. Elsewhere in the Apologies, it is the plural form οἱ λόγοι which refers to the Old Testament (e.g. I. 37:1; 47:1; 49:1; 63:10; 40:5; 54:6), whereas the singular form carries the technical and personal connotation. Thus, it can be said that Justin's works (Apologies and Dialogue) are formally "discourse" (λόγος), in which the Scriptures (especially ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος) hold the prominent place. Intrinsically, however, his works are "doctrine." The spermatic logos, he says, is in every man in part, while the full logos came in Jesus Christ. It is difficult to understand why Goodenough, in agreement with A. L. Feder, believes that, "the Logos is not fundamental for the theology of Justin, but that it is merely an explanation of the really Christian doctrine of the Son of God."¹ To be sure, the Apologist feels free to use the term

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 140. Feder, *Justin des Märtyres Lehre von Jesus Christus*

logos to indicate Stoic (II. 7:3, 8; 8:1), philosophical (D. 2:2), or Christian (I. 3:2) doctrines in general. The great majority of texts, however, shows that logos refers either to the spermatic Logos which God has placed in man's *nous* (cf. also the alpha privative forms *ἄλογος* and *ἀλόγως*), or to the pre-incarnate or incarnate Christ.¹ Thus the term logos in Justin indicates mainly Christian doctrine.

a. Justin's basic theological emphasis says that God's redemptive work through his Logos has been fully realized in history. Before the incarnation, the Logos accomplished God's work among the two main divisions of the human race—Gentiles and Jews. Christ was known in part to Socrates (II. 10:8). Socrates, by means of a true logos (*λόγῳ ἀληθεῖ*, dative of impersonal agent), sought to expose the true nature of demons and, because of this, the sage was put to death (I. 5:3). Demons were not only reprov'd among Greeks through Socrates, by means of a logos (*ὑπὸ λόγου*, i.e. genitive of personal agency) but among the Barbarians, by the Logos himself (*ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ λόγου*) who became man, being called Jesus Christ (I. 5:4). The significant part of this section is the "preparation-fulfillment" emphasis that moves from the pre-Christian Gentile world, as represented by Socrates and other sages, to the incarnate Christ. That is, Justin thinks that the ancient sages spoke, each one from a part of the spermatic Divine logos (*ἕκαστος γὰρ τις ἀπὸ μέρους τοῦ σπερματικοῦ θεοῦ λόγου . . . ἐφθέγγετο*, II. 13:3) which was given to him. In addition, I. 46:2 names Christ the Logos of whom every race of men partakes (*μέτεσχε*).

b. To a far greater degree, however, the writer finds that before the Christian era, the pre-incarnate Logos, as the Divine agent, carried out God's work among the Jews preparing them for the actual consummation of the Divine redemptive process in the historical appearance and work of Jesus.² It is in the Old Testament especially that Justin discovers the record of "that self-disclosure

(Freiburg: Herdersche Verlagshandlung, 1906), p. 154, goes beyond Goodenough in denying the presence of the Logos in the Dialogue.

¹ O. A. Piper, *JR*, XLI, 3 (1961), 167, note 52, shows how Justin has been misunderstood in this respect.

² Thus, notwithstanding Goodenough, *it is* the Logos doctrine that constitutes Justin's main theological emphasis, the movement in the Apologies being from the Logos in part to the full Logos, in the Dialogue, from the pre-incarnate to the incarnate Logos.

of the Logos by which his full manifestation is being prepared.”¹ This self-disclosure appears in three ways:

- (1) In the work of the pre-incarnate Logos at creation,
- (2) In the work of the pre-incarnate Logos in the history of God's people, and
- (3) In the prophecies (predictions and types) of the life and work of the incarnate Logos.

Thus Justin sees an underlying unity in God's work in creation and history centering in the work of the Logos. He also senses that God is directing that history toward a definite goal through the Logos.

(1) The work of the pre-incarnate Logos in creation. Justin is as fully committed to a personal Logos as Philo, for example, is committed to an impersonal logos. The name Logos is sufficient for his purposes in the First Apology, but in his Dialogue which is more thorough, Justin feels obliged to prove the existence of a second God.² Justin believes that the Logos precedes creation (II. 6:3).³ He affirms the Logos to be the first-begotten one of God (πρῶτον γέννημα τοῦ θεοῦ, I. 21:1), i.e. before all creatures (D. 62:4; 129:4). He is likewise the first-begotten (πρωτότοκος, I. 23:2; 33:6) of “the unbegotten God” (I. 53:2), or “of God” (I. 63:15).⁴ By means of three figures, Justin spells out his meaning. The Logos is as light from the sun (D. 128:3-4), as fire from fire (D. 61:2; 128:4), and as a spoken word from thought (D. 61:2). As for the work of the Logos in creation, Goodenough thinks that Justin speaks in two ways. First, according to Goodenough, as Justin considers creation and its process, he speaks of the seminal Logos of God in an impersonal way. Second, Goodenough holds that Justin affirms the personal Logos to be the spermatic

¹ Piper, *JR*, XLI, 3 (1961), p. 161.

² Goodenough, *op. cit.*, p. 141. Goodenough shows that the identification of Logos with second God is without question.

³ Goodenough, *ibid.*, pp. 154-155, thinks that the Apologist means that the Logos originated shortly before creation.

⁴ The terminology of I. 63:15 is important. Christ πρωτότοκος ὢν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ θεὸς ὑπάρχει, “though he is first-begotten of the God he is also God.” The articular τοῦ θεοῦ followed by the anarthrous θεός, shows Justin's debt to Philo (cf. “On Dreams,” *Philo* V, 416, 418) whose anti-anthropomorphism appears in his distinction between ὁ θεός (= the one who is truly God) and θεός (= secondary “beings”). The fact that θεός (without article) meant for Justin a second Divine personality shows his basic difference from Philo. Compare also D. 91:1; 138:2; 85:2; 116:3; 125:3; I. 46:2.

principle but without creative activity, never acting as an inferior creating deity, a δημιουργός.¹ Goodenough finds his evidence in Justin's use of the dative of means in I. 59:5 (λόγω θεοῦ), or in his use of the preposition διὰ with the genitive in I. 64:5 (διὰ λόγου). Does Goodenough substantiate his view? In view of a similar dative of means in Psalms 33:6 (LXX, 32:6)² and from the use of the preposition διὰ with the Logos or Christ in John 1:3; Col. 1:16; Hebrews 1:2, it would appear quite possible—against Goodenough—to consider Justin's thought as moving in the Biblical sphere, i.e. the personal Christ is God's agent in creation.

(2) The work of the pre-incarnate Logos in the history of God's people.

(a) One of the longest sections in the Dialogue is chapter 56 where Justin constructs his argument to prove that there is a second God (= the Logos), distinct from the supreme God in number (ἀριθμῶ) but not in will (ἀλλὰ οὐ γνώμη, D. 56:11). Justin attempts to show that one of the three persons who appeared to Abraham under the oaks of Mamre (Gen. 18:1-2) was the Logos, that the double use of the title κύριος in Gen. 19:24 refers respectively to the Logos and to the supreme God, and that it is the Logos or the second God who communes with Abram as Abram intercedes (Gen. 18:23-33). He is also the God who comes to Sarah at the promised time of Isaac's birth (Gen. 18:10), and who is elsewhere (Psalms 110:1; 45:6-7) called God. This second God, however, not only appears but shows his mighty power. He destroys Sodom, delivers Lot, and fulfills his promise by giving a son to Abraham and Sarah.

(b) The history of Jacob, says Justin, also shows the appearance and power of the same Divine person (D. 58). He appears to Jacob as Jacob is on his way to Haran (Gen. 28:10-17), as he is there (Gen. 31:10-13), and as returns to Canaan (Gen. 32:22-32).

(c) The appearance of this second God (= the Logos or Angel of the Lord) to Moses at the burning bush (Exod. 3:1 ff.) and the exercise of his power in Moses' life, receive attention both in the Dialogue (D. 59-60) and the First Apology (I. 62-63). The reference in the First Apology lies in the context of the rite of Christian baptism in which the authority of the Divine name is

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 166.

² τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ κυρίου οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἐστερεώθησαν.

Christ not only has power now in the Christian sacrament, but, in fact, its power was known to Moses. Our Christ, says Justin, communed with Moses out of the burning bush, yea, he equipped Moses with mighty power for his coming task of leading Israel out of Egypt (I. 62:3-4). Justin observes that the Jews did not know this truth but were led to think that it was the unnameable God and not the Logos who spoke to Moses (I. 63:1, 11, 14). The writer speaks in a similar way in the Dialogue. He adds, however, that even a person with limited intelligence will recognize that the supreme God never left his supra-celestial domain to appear on a tiny portion of earth (D. 60:2). That is, the one who *did appear* was his Son, the Angel or the Logos.

(d) Likewise the Apologist cites the appearance in power of the Captain of the Lord's host to Joshua (Josh. 5:13 ff.) as another piece of evidence for the presence of the Logos among God's people (D. 62).

(3) The prophecies (predictions and types) of the life and work of the incarnate Logos. In a few references, the writer describes the Logos as the moving, inspiring power which spoke through the prophets. In I. 33:9, he writes, "By means of no other except the Divine Logos are those who prophesy borne (along) by God." Quite apart from the dative of means (λόγῳ θεῷ), the sentence is impressive in that it contains the unique compound verb *θεοφορεῖν* (only here and in I. 35:3 in Justin's writings). The verb does not occur either in the LXX or the New Testament. Possibly, however, the verb was used in some Greek reading that underlies the Latin translation in 1 Cor. 6:20, *glorificate et portate deum in corpore vestro*.¹ During the lifetime of Justin, another great saint used quite freely the adjectival formation *θεοφόρος* (i.e. *IGNATIOΣ ὁ καὶ θεοφόρος* in the salutation of each of the seven genuine Ignatian letters, cf. also *θεοφόροι*, used of the Ephesian Christians in IEph. 9:1). W. Bauer suggests that the term *θεοφόρος*, not encountered before Ignatius, was created by Ignatius and for him.² J. B. Lightfoot thinks that the term is undoubtedly invoked (I. 61:10). The writer affirms that the name of Jesus

¹ Compare Wordsworth and White, *Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesus Christi Latine*; Pars secunda—Epistulae Paulinae (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941), 204.

² *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments* . . . , 5th ed. (Berlin: A. Topelmann, 1958), 709.

active, and thus to be accented on the penult, θεοφόρος, i.e. "bearing God."¹ Theodore Zahn had reached the same conclusion earlier.² As far as the verb form in Justin's use is concerned (I. 33:9, to which the dative of means, λόγῳ θεῷ is joined), it lays stress on the moving force behind the work of the prophets. Likewise in I. 36:1, the writer finds that the words of the prophets were not spoken as from the inspired ones themselves (μὴ ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἐμπενευσμένων, but from the Divine Logos moving them (ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τοῦ κινουῦντος αὐτοὺς θείου λόγου). Again, in II. 10:8, it is the Logos who through the prophets spoke beforehand the things that were about to take place. But aside from these references, the main stress falls upon the prophecies themselves (predictions and types) which reveal the person and work of the incarnate Logos. These prophecies will come under special review in Propositions III-IV.

2. According to *Ev. Ver.* In *Ev. Ver.*, truth is viewed as a human experience in which, through the Father's Logos, man finds gnosis for his ignorance and completeness for his lack. Just as in the writings of the Apologist, so here in *Ev. Ver.*, Divine truth is mediated through the Logos (cf. 16:34), truth which appears, however, not in the scene of history as much as in the realm of human experience. The basic message of *Ev. Ver.* can probably best be understood through its "parables." These parables stand in relation to the message of Truth (according to *Ev. Ver.*) as the parables of the New Testament gospels stand in relation to the message of the kingdom of God. Eleven of the parables of *Ev. Ver.* will be considered now.³ Five of the eleven have to do with the message of truth as gnosis, six pertain to truth as completeness. The parables are introduced by the formula ἄπρῃτε, "like, just as." In the case of two parables, however (the shepherd, 31:35-32:16, and the doctor, 35:30-36:5), the formula (πρῃτε in both instances, cf. 32:15 and 35:35) appears in the application of the parable. Nearly all of the parables have two things in common; first, they describe the existential position of the All—humankind and creation as a whole, and second, they indicate in some manner

¹ *The Apostolic Fathers*, part II, vol. II, sect. I (London: Macmillan & Co., 1885), 21-23.

² *Ignatius von Antiochien* (Gotha: Friedrich A. Perthes, 1873), pp. 69 ff.

³ The other parables (cf., e.g. the opportune time, 28:3-5, the anointing-seals, 36:21-29, the Father's aroma, 33:39 ff.) are considered subsequently.

a way out of the human dilemma. Occasionally the parable is cast in a brief form so that one of the other of these two basic emphases is omitted. In such cases, however, the missing member may be inferred or supplied from the context.

a. Parables that describe how a-gnostic man experiences gnosis.

(1) The parable of the fog, 17:9-14. "Ignorance of the Father produced fright with terror, and Fright imprisoned like a fog so that no one was able to see out." The parable with its context suggests the following line of thought:

(a) Due to Ignorance, the All who belong to the Father are separated from him (17:4-10).

(b) Separation connotes a fearful, aimless existence without any visible purpose or goal.

(c) Separation means also that man lives an empty material life under the control of evil powers (= Error). The construction in 17:15-16 (α̅ς̅ ρω̅δ̅ α̅†̅ ρ̅τ̅λ̅η̅ η̅τες̅) reveals that matter (ρ̅τ̅λ̅η̅ = υ̅λη̅) belongs to Error.

(d) Man lives in the "middle" (17:34-35). While the power of Error seeks to cause man to forget (i.e. his origin) and to take man captive (17:33 ff.), the Father's gnosis is revealed to nullify Forgetting and make the Father known (18:4 ff.). Such is the movement of thought in the parable and in its context. Origen in his commentary on John (XIII. 20) has preserved a passage from Heracleon containing a close relationship to the parable. After Origen himself states on John 4:23 that the true worshippers are those whom the Father seeks through the Son who came to seek and save what was lost, he cites Heracleon's exegesis. Heracleon, he says, affirmed that what belongs to the Father (τὸ οἰκεῖον τῷ Πατρὶ) has become lost in the deep matter of Error ἐν τῇ βαθείᾳ υ̅λη̅ τῆς πλάνης), and that it is this lost thing which the Father, according to John 4:23, is seeking.¹ That is, in both Heracleon and *Ev. Ver.*, Error "claims" matter as its own possession. The particular experience suggested by the parable of *Ev. Ver.* is one of frustration. There is no visible direction or goal to life. Due to his inability to "see through" (cf. η̅ε̅ν̅ α̅δ̅α̅λ̅ in 17:13-14) to a goal, man is brought into a *hulic* existence which is altogether empty and void of truth (17:16-18). The phrase ε̅τ̅δ̅ε̅ η̅ει̅, "therefore" (17:14), gives a strong cause-effect stress to the

¹ Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, XIV, 432.

parable. Man gropes in vain for meaning to life and, as a result, he settles for a vain substitute—material existence—where Error “causes him to forget”¹ his origin (i.e. in the Father). As a cure for the condition, the writer issues a challenge and proclaims the “gospel.” The challenge which he issues is to “despise Error” (17:28-29) and, with it, the material existence which Error owns. The very fact that the writer can issue such a challenge means the possibility of response. That possibility lies in the presence of the spiritual seed imbedded in nature, the τὸ οἰκεῖον τῷ Πατρὶ that is lost in the deep matter of Error (cf. Heracleon), which inspires the All to seek after the one from whom they came (cf. *Ev. Ver.* 17:4-6). The attraction (cf. the verb *σωκ* in 17:34) of a material existence, however, makes the challenge by itself ineffective. Therefore the writer proclaims the “gospel”, the unveiling of the hidden gnosis of the Father in the coming of Jesus Christ. The work of ἡμε is nullified and the truth of the Father is proclaimed (18:15-21). Thus the frustration and terror and emptiness within are solved, according to the writer, in the coming of Jesus.

(2) The parable of the father and his offspring, 19:10-14. “[The Father is] like one from whom many come forth who are ignorant of him; he desires to be known and thus to be loved.” The translation seems quite probable though both the French and English renderings in the *Ev. Ver.* text supply the word “messenger.”² Context, however, gives solid support for the rendering suggested above. In 19:8-10, the text states that the All was in him (i.e. the Father) though in need of him, while 19:15-17 affirms that the one thing which the All lacked was gnosis of the Father. Set between these two texts, therefore, the parable becomes clear. Uniquely it assumes the Father’s point of view. The context states that men lack the choicest of all realities (so the word indicates)—gnosis of the Father. But no less does the Father sense the lack. He desires to be known and loved. Grobel³ observes how knowing and loving are linked together in the New Testament (1 John 4:7-8; 5:2-3; Phil. 1:9). The first tractate of the Hermetic Corpus should also be mentioned, i.e. ἅγιος ὁ θεός, ὃς γνωσθῆναι βούλεται

¹ The form ἡμε is causative (cf. *Crum*, 519b).

² Pp. 9. 91.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 57, note 82.

καὶ γινώσκεται τοῖς ἰδίοις.¹ Thus the parable affirms that in spite of the fog in which man lives—unable to see out—he can know and love God. A dynamic element is present. From the human point of view, the parable means an experience of relatedness. To know God and to love him means to stand in a meaningful relationship to him. In affirming this relationship. *Ev. Ver.* shows an important connection with the Bible.

(3) The parable of the drunkard, 22:13-20. "The one who in this way will have gnosis understands whence he arose and whither he goes. He understands just as one intoxicated has separated himself from his drinking which set him apart alone, (and) has set in order the things which are his." The preface to the parable contains a portion of the well-known gnostic formula found in fuller form in *Exc. Theod.* 78:2, where it is set in a context having to do with baptism. "But the washing is not the only thing which gives freedom but also the gnosis, [i.e. gnosis of] who we were, what we have become, where we were, or into what we were thrown [ἐνεβλήθημεν]; whither we are hastening, from whence we are being redeemed; what birth is; what new birth is."² The reference in Theodotus to baptism as "washing" is similar to Justin (I. 61) who cites baptism as a λουτρόν and a φωτισμός, that is, washing and illumination. *Ev. Ver.*, however, reflects no certain word on baptism. With respect to the gnostic formula, Irenaeus reports a similar formula which the gnostic repeats upon reaching the principalities and powers (γινώσκω ὅθεν εἰμί . . .).³ The introduction to the parable of *Ev. Ver.* indicates that there are three stages in the experience of the intoxicated man; an original sobriety (its meaning unrealized), intoxication, and finally, an enlightened sobriety. The original sobriety means the condition in which one was; intoxication implies alienation and the loss of oneself; the aftermath or the new sobriety represents the realization of oneself and one's true destiny. The idea of *Ev. Ver.* approximates that of *felix culpa*, i.e. only by means of contrast can one become aware of his origin and destiny.⁴ The knowledge pictured by the

¹ *Corpus Hermeticum*, I, ed. A. D. Nock, A.-J. Festugière (Paris: Les belles Lettres, 1945), 18.

² R. P. Casey, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

³ *Adv. H.*, I. 21:5, W. W. Harvey, *op. cit.*, I, 187. References to other parallels are cited in the *notes critiques* of the *Ev. Ver.* text, p. 54.

⁴ H. Jonas, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*, I (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1934), 115-118, cites numerous ancient texts comparing drunk-

one who becomes sober consists mainly of two things: knowledge of God and knowledge of himself. Both ideas are present in *Exc. Theod.*, 78:2, but it is the second idea mainly that emerges from the *Ev. Ver.* parable. Just as the drunken man during intoxication loses his true identity, "the qualities that make him himself,"¹ so without his knowing it, the a-gnostic one has become drunk and fails to recognize who he really is. One cannot miss the strong accent on human experience which the parable conveys. Here is the message of truth, according to *Ev. Ver.*

(4) The parable of children from an adult man, 27:10-15. "All spaces are offspring of him. They have known that they have come forth from him just like children being in an adult man [have come forth from him]." The preface to the parable contains at least two problems, one exegetical and one textual. The first has to do with the meaning of ⲙⲁⲉⲓⲧ, "spaces." Grobel, who simply inserts the Coptic word into his translation, is uncertain as to whether, in this text, the word means "living persons" or personified beings.² The context apparently indicates that the word has neither a literal sense nor the meaning "way" (cf. 18:19-20). Does it indicate modes of existence, e.g. angels, archangels, gnostics, or *hulic* men? It is probably not to be equated with ⲡⲧⲏⲣⲉ̅, "the All" since in the context (27:10-13) the gnosis ascribed to the spaces can hardly be said to belong to the All, for only the Gnostics know. The textual problem pertains to the word ⲫ. The above translation accepts ⲫ as the equivalent of ⲫⲏ which is found elsewhere in *Ev. Ver.*, i.e. "offspring." Thus, whoever ⲙⲁⲉⲓⲧ ⲏⲓⲕⲁ (27:10-11) may mean, they are God's offspring. Notwithstanding these two problems in the introductory part of the parable, to a degree at least, the interpretation is clear. In both form and meaning, the parable is similar to the second parable treated above (i.e. 19:10-14). God's offspring have their existence, their rank, because of the Father. The passage reveals

eness to an a-gnostic state. Thus, e.g., in *Corpus Hermeticum*, VII, 1, the writer cites, "the wine of ignorance;" in the Odes of Solomon, 11, the text reads, "my drunkenness was not that of Ignorance but I turned away from nothingness." Cf. also the "Hymn of the Pearl" in the *Acta Thomae*, which Jonas in *The Gnostic Religion* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1958), p. 69, translates, "They mixed me drink with their cunning and gave me to taste of their meat. . . through the heaviness of their nourishment I sank into deep slumber."

¹ Grobel, *op. cit.*, p. 79, note 160.

² *Ibid.*, p. 111, note 272.

a strict Jewish monotheism. On the one hand there is nothing outside of God, but on the other hand, what does exist, is God's offspring, though not God. At the same time the parable is extremely naïve. There is no mention of any destiny of those who have come forth from him. Into what have they come? For what reason did they issue from him? A comparison of the passage with John 16:28 reveals a similarity in terminology but a vast difference in total outlook. Jesus says, "I came forth from the Father," but he adds, "I am come into the world," a world of time and space, a world of men alienated from God, and yet, a world destined to be the place where God will carry out his plan perfectly. If the words $\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\ \eta\mu\iota\alpha$ (27:10-11) indicate that each cosmic power has its assigned realm of operation beyond which it cannot go, the contrast with the Biblical idea at once becomes especially sharp.

(5) The parable of the nightmare, 28:32-30:14. The parable proper (29:8-31) is preceded first, by the "Gnostic confession" of his dreamy, phantom-like life before the dawning of the Father's gnosis (28:26-32), and second, by a description of the general instability of an a-gnostic existence (28:32-29:8). It is important to see how the parable describes one of the central emphases of *Ev. Ver.*, the experience of the truth of the Father's gnosis. Modern existentialism would search far to find a more gripping portrayal of one of its favorite themes—the dilemma of modern man. In the nightmare, man reflects fear and tension ("pursued by others"), continual failure and frustration ("without strength they come, when they have pursued after certain ones" ¹); he lusts for power yet experiences defeat ("striking others . . . being struck"); he feels the constant threat of danger ("falling from high places . . . raised up without wings"), and reveals both a fear of murder and a murderous spirit ("being killed . . . killing others"). In brief, man's entire existence in $\alpha\gamma\upsilon\omicron\lambda\alpha$ is void of meaning and purpose. And yet, there is hope. The light dawns, the sleeper awakens and realizes the nothingness of his troubling nightmare (29:28-32). Only after his awakening does he discover that his true existence lies in the day or in the light and that his nightmare was a delusion. The parable has a relationship first of all to the

¹ This renders the sense of Till's translation which is based on a different division of the last two words of 29:13 ($\epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\epsilon\ \epsilon\alpha\pi\tau\omega\tau$ instead of *Ev. Ver.* text, $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\epsilon\ \alpha\pi\tau\omega\tau$). See *Orientalia*, N.S., 27 (1958), 277.

parable of the fog, for, there is a terror and blindness to the fog (17:9-14) like unto that of the nightmare. The parable is also related to that of the drunkard, but with a wider scope. Not all men know drunkenness first-hand, but all men do experience troubling dreams. The parable is particularly apropos. All have come from the Father and yet all do not know him (cf. e.g. 17:4-8) and are "in the Middle" where Error's Forgetting reigns (17:28-37). Then the awakening comes and the gnostic tosses Ignorance from him as one shakes himself from sleep (29:32-36). Since the writer is serious, he must indicate that a decisive experiential change occurs. At least three things are involved in the change. First, there is an element of choice. The enlightened Gnostics cast Ignorance from them (29:33-35); they consciously test the gospel of truth and decide to live in it. Second, they experience joy (30:12-14).¹ Third, they discover a new and cherished object of value—the gnosis of the Father (30:4-5). The Gnostics "measure" or "value" (ἡμετέρῃ, 30:5) the Father's gnosis as men value the light.

b. Parables that describe the message of truth as completeness.

(1) The parable of the complete book, 23:11-18. "Because each consonant is a complete thought like a book that is complete, for they are consonants written through oneness, because the Father wrote them in order that through these consonants of his the Aeons might know the Father." The translation "thought" (23:11) is based on a textual emendation of W. Till.² The parable itself is quite brief. In the preceding context, the writer apparently protests against a Jewish type of exegesis where men believe that true understanding consists in knowing the meaning of each letter of a given book or in ascribing a special meaning to each letter. In another sense, however, the writer himself is not free from this type of exegesis, for he affirms that each of the chosen ones of the Father constitutes a complete thought like to a complete book. The idea is a strange one. Generally, one understands that a consonant by itself is incomplete; it needs other consonants (with vowel sounds) to form a meaningful word. It is different for the writer of *Ev. Ver.* By completeness, he means relatedness to the Father, but the parable carries with it no idea of relatedness on the horizontal plane. If each individual Gnostic is related to the Father in a complete way, the necessity for a Gnostic fellowship

¹ The end of the parable is in 30:14. Cf. Schenke, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

² Cf. the discussion of the textual problem in chapter I above, p. 22, note 1.

of believers may be seriously questioned. It is true that in 18:38-40, the writer speaks of the Father and his members (ἡμεῖς μέλη) in terms reminiscent of the Pauline idea of the body and its members (cf. e.g. 1 Cor. 12). And yet the language of 18:38-40 may imply nothing more than the existence of individual Gnostics who are members individually of the Father (sic! not of Christ, as in 1 Cor 12). *Ev. Ver.* thus lacks the element of community—so vital in the New Testament (cf. e.g. Eph. 4:25, ἐσμὲν ἀλλήλων μέλη), and fosters the idea of an individualistic faith, thereby dispensing with the larger fellowship of believers.¹ The affirmation that the book contains consonants of truth (23:8-9) suggests some kind of mystical recognition of the true nature of the living ones. The purpose of the book is that the Aeons might know the Father. Whether “Aeons” contains a spatial (modes of existence) or temporal (periods of existence) meaning is not clear. What is clear is the writer’s firm conviction that Divine completeness means individual relatedness to the Father. The meaning that Christ the Logos has to the book of consonants of Truth is found in the hymn of the Logos which follows (23:18-33).

(2) The parable of the ignorant one and of darkness, 24:32-25:3. “Just as one who is ignorant and then comes to know, his ignorance of itself normally disappears, just as darkness normally disappears when the light is manifested, so also the Lack disappears by means of the Completeness.” The parable uses characteristic gnostic symbols.² The context affirms that the Father abolishes the Lack and gives Completeness because Jesus brings the All to the Father (24:21-32). The Lack means lack of gnosis of the Father just as completeness implies that the Father is known and relationship with him is established. There is a single-mindedness about *Ev. Ver.* that refuses to be diverted in any way. The ignorant one lacks gnosis just as the dark place lacks light. Through Jesus, the gospel of truth announces the coming of gnosis and light. The parable indicates no concern for the various media which God uses to manifest himself and his will, no concern for the problems of life in the world. Furthermore, no concern is shown for a moral change within man. On the contrary, the prepositional

¹ S. Laeuchli, *The Language of Faith* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), p. 86 f., senses that the metaphor of the body, in *Ev. Ver.*, is understood only in a vertical way.

² Cf. Grobel, *op. cit.*, p. 99, note 226.

phrase $\rho\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\omicron\tau\epsilon$, "of itself" (24:35-36), suggests an instinctive feature in the experience of salvation which dulls the challenge of the gospel. The sense of "lack" or "deficiency" simply disappears through completeness. Completeness in *Ev. Ver.* indicates relationship to the Father. Completeness in the Bible, however, means reproduction (Gen. 1:26) and overflowing abundance (John 4:14; 7:37-39; 10:11).

(3) The parable of fire, light, and life, 25:12-19. "He will be purified by gnosis out of diversity into oneness since (gnosis) consumes the matter within him just as fire (consumes), and as darkness (is consumed) by light, death by life." The parable shows the concern of *Ev. Ver.* for the problem of philosophers—the far-reaching diversity in life. The writer indicates that diversity by itself is evil. Goodness, therefore, means $\tau\acute{o}\ \delta\upsilon$. The apparent diversity of the world points to a vacuum which gnosis fills. Precisely here *Ev. Ver.* shows a contrast with the writings of Justin as well as with the Bible. In the Bible, the fullness and diversity of the universe are evidences that God is the creator. All diversity is in the service of the one God.

(4) The parable of the bad and the good vessels in the house, 25:25-26:15. The exegesis of the parable is given in chapter I above. The main concern now is to sense the message of completeness which the parable contains. By the word "house" (25:31) the writer probably means the world. It is also probable that the same word means "world" in 25:23 where the textual notes of *Ev. Ver.* suggest either the meaning "world" or "the Gnostics."¹ The "master of the house" is the Father. The writer apparently sees the world as belonging to the Father (i.e. God is the Father of the All). Since the parable proper is divided into two parts (25:25-35; 26:7-15) with two different emphases, it is quite possible that reference is made respectively to two aspects of Divine judgment—the removal of the *hulic* vessels (25:25 ff.) and the purifying judgment on the "gnostic vessels" (26:4 ff.). The parable may have been suggested to the writer of *Ev. Ver.* by Rom. 9:21-23 and/or 2 Tim. 2:20-21. The *Ev. Ver.* passage contains no fewer than three connections with the Timothy passage. First, in both texts there is mention of the "householder" and the "house" where the vessels are put (cf. *Ev. Ver.* 25:31, 23, and 2 Tim. 2:20, $\epsilon\upsilon\ \mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta$...

¹ P. 55.

οἰκία,¹ and 2:21, ὁ δεσπότης). Second, in both texts the vessels are said to be of two contrasting varieties, good and bad. Third, in both texts, a cleansing process occurs so that vessels are made useful to the master of the household. In the passage in Timothy, the usefulness of a vessel depends on the moral responsibility of the individual: in *Ev. Ver.* vessels are made fit through the coming of Divine judgment (κρίσις, 25:36) and through the "incarnation" of the Logos (26:8). There is, however, some hint of a painful, purifying experience which the Gnostics undergo in becoming useful to the Father (26:4 ff.). The writer uses two important terms to describe the true vessels; (a) They are sound (qual. form $\Sigma\alpha\kappa\omicron\tau\alpha\delta\alpha\lambda$ in 25:35), the same term used frequently by the writer to mean "completeness" or "perfection," and (b) They are full (qual. $\Lambda\eta\rho$ in 25:34; infin. $\Lambda\alpha\rho$ in 26:11-12). He indicates that the experience of completeness or fullness is Divine (cf. the Divine judgment and the incarnation of the Logos). Moreover, he declares that man passes through a purifying process preparatory to the experience of completeness. But what are the clear-cut media through which the process occurs? When, where, how does it happen?

(5) The parable of the lost sheep, 31:35-32:16. The parable emphasizes two primary things. First, the work of Jesus in making the Father known is indispensable. Second, Completeness can be realized through the Father. Notwithstanding the evidence that points to a close literary affinity between the parable² and the parable of Matthew and Luke, the basic idea of the New Testament story is completely transformed in *Ev. Ver.* The Biblical parable reveals the love of God for the lost individual no matter how wayward and lost he may be (cf., e.g. the context in Luke 15:1-2). In contrast, the *Ev. Ver.* parable is concerned with the one who lacks completeness which comes through the Father. The importance of the one sheep lies in the fact that by its recovery, the number of sheep reaches a total of 100, which is the sign of the Father's

¹ It is suggested above that "house" in *Ev. Ver.* 25:23, 31 means "world." Many patristic commentaries assign the meaning "world" also, to οἰκία in 2 Tim. 2:20, though modern commentaries prefer the meaning "church." Cf. W. Lock, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924), p. 101.

² Cf. the exegesis of the parable in Chapter I above.

right hand, or of completeness.¹ A translation of 32:9-17 is important in this connection. It reads, "Thus [it is with] him [= the Father] who lacks the one [i.e. thus it is with] him who is the whole right hand which draws [to it] that which lacks and takes it forth from the left part and [as a result] it changes over to the right. Thus the sum becomes 100, the sign of him who is in their voice. It is the Father."² The Valentinian interpretation of the parable of the lost sheep which Irenaeus offers,³ seems to show that the bishop of Lyons was acquainted with *Ev. Ver.* Harvey's text of this passage in Irenaeus reads as follows:

*Adhuc autem materialia sinistram vocantes, et ex necessitate quae sunt sinistrae in corruptionem cedere dicentes, et Salvatorem venisse ad ovem perditam, ut eam transferat ad dextram, id est ad illas quae sunt salutis nonaginta et novem oves, quae non perierunt, sed in ovili permanserunt, sinistrae manus existentes, levamen non esse salutis consentire eos necesse est. Et hoc quod non similiter eundem numerum habet, cogentur sinistrae, id est corruptionis confiteri:*⁴

The close parallels with the text of *Ev. Ver.* are apparent without further attention. The meaning of the parable, however, calls for consideration. The Valentinians, says Irenaeus, interpret the parable to mean that the ninety-nine sheep who enjoy rest (*levamen* = ἀνάπαυσις) in the fold, do not necessarily enjoy salvation. As long as they are in the "left hand" a deficiency inevitably exists, because the left hand is material (cf. *Adv. H.*, I. 5:1; 6:1) and thus partakes of corruption. Harvey notices that, to the Valentinians, ἀνάπαυσις was *in parte materialium*.⁵ In an attempt to show the ridiculous nature of the Valentinian numerology, Irenaeus points out that the number-value of the cherished Greek words ἀγάπη (= 93) and ἀλήθεια (= 64) as well as the number-value of many other words, is less than 100. Thus, he says, the Valentinians are compelled to reckon these sacred words as material and corruptible.⁶ The idea of completeness which the parable contains is one of a full

¹ The contrast between the "right" and "left" hands is alluded to no fewer than three times in *Adv. H.* (I. 5:1; 6:1; II. 24:6) in Irenaeus' discussion of the Valentinian system.

² W. C. van Unnik, *Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings*, pp. 60-61, thinks that "the one" means the Father.

³ *Adv. H.*, II. 24:6.

⁴ Harvey, *op. cit.*, I, 341-342.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, I, 342, note 1.

⁶ *Adv. H.*, II. 24:6.

quota of *gnostikoi*. The experience of salvation can occur only as the full number of their elect are gathered in. There is a similar idea in the response given to the complaint of martyrs of the gospel, according to Rev. 6:11, "They were . . . told to rest a little longer, until the number of their fellow servants and their brethren should be complete, who were to be killed as they themselves had been" (RSV). The martyrs are at rest but the fullness of their salvation must await the completion of their full number. What that number is, is not stated. Likewise, Rev. 7:1-8 pictures a providential withholding of cosmic destructive powers until the full number of God's servants has been sealed, i.e. 144,000. There is, however, a basic difference between the book of the Revelation and *Ev. Ver.* Completeness, according to *Ev. Ver.*, is narrow and exclusive. There is a limited number which has been fixed in advance. In the Revelation, however, while the number 12 symbolizes election, the number 144,000 shows how boundless election is in its extent.

(6) The parable of the doctor, 35:30-36:5. "For the doctor hurries to the place where a sick man is, for that is his desire within him. Moreover, he [i.e. the sick one] who lacks does not hide it, for he [i.e. the doctor] has that which he [i.e. the sick one] lacks" (35:30-35). There is very little literary connection between the passage and the picture in the New Testament gospels of Jesus as physician. Nevertheless, the influence of the New Testament portrayal on *Ev. Ver.* is apparent. Furthermore, each part of the description of the action, the attitude, and ability, of the physician in relation to the sick man, is ascribed elsewhere in *Ev. Ver.* to the Son or to the Father. Thus, the clause, "he hastens to where the sick man is" (35:30-31), may be compared to 41:7, "his desire is to be with him" (35:31-33), to the Father's desire (cf., e.g. 22:9, 10, 35; 37:5-7), and "He has what he [i.e. the sick one] lacks" (35:34-35), to 38:12-15. A noteworthy feature of the parable is that it preserves an *agraphon* found also in the Diatessaron as given in Ephraem's commentary.¹ The Latin translation of the Armenian text of that commentary, a translation made by L. Leloir, renders the *agraphon* as follows: *Sed ubi dolores sunt, ait, ibi festinat medicus.*² The *agraphon* is cited by Ephraem in

¹ Cf. *Ev. Ver. Supplementum*, notes critiques, p. 17.

² *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium*, vol. 145 (1954), p. 175, lines 20-21.

reply to the question of the disciples addressed to Jesus, "Rabbi, the Jews were but now seeking to stone you, and are you going there [i.e. into Judea] again?" (RSV of John 11:8b). The saying then follows immediately. "But where the sick are, he said, there the doctor hastens." In 1899, A. Resch cited the *agraphon* but observed that its source was unknown.¹ Now, from the text of *Ev. Ver.*, a second witness to the saying comes to light. For an understanding of the parable in *Ev. Ver.*, the *agraphon* indicates clearly that by "doctor," the writer means Jesus. But beyond this fact, the parable shows that the "sick" man lacks the medicine of gnosis or grace (cf. ρΛΑΤ in 36:7). He realizes what his sickness is and does not hide it. The writer is apparently saying that it lies within the ability of man to conceal or reveal his "sickness," i.e. his a-gnostic condition. To confess his need means at the same time that Jesus supplies what is needed.² Taken by itself, the parable might suggest some personal experience of the historical Jesus, but the application of the parable beginning with 35:35 makes the suggestion doubtful. The picture of the physician fades away into abstraction, i.e. "The *pleroma* which contains no lack fills the lack . . ." (35:35-37). The sick one then does not confront Jesus personally but receives fullness and completion for his own lack of gnosis of the Father.

Summary and Comparison

Justin uses the term Logos mainly to denote the person of the pre-incarnate and incarnate Christ. Besides the role of the Logos in creation and prior to his incarnate work in Jesus of Nazareth, Justin discovers that the Logos performed his work among Greeks (cf. I. 5:3-4) as well as among Jews (cf. I. 63:10; D. 56). Whether it be to Abraham, Jacob, Moses, or to Joshua, God's truth, says Justin, is gradually unfolded in history through the agency of the Logos. To the prophets, the Logos appears as the one who inspires the predictions concerning himself. Thus, in a consistent manner, Justin presents truth as a Divine process in which the Logos of God is always the active agent.

The writer of *Ev. Ver.* also believes that Divine truth is mediated through the Logos. The Logos reveals God's truth, however, not in objective historical event as is true in Justin's writings,

¹ *Texte und Untersuchungen*, V, 4 (1889), 443.

² Cf. the gnostic "confession" in *Ev. Ver.* 28:26-28.

but in subjective human experience. The parables reveal a breadth to the writer's knowledge of human experience. Man, he says, not only knows the frustration and terror (fog and nightmare parables) and enigma of diversity (fire, light, life parable) in the world in which he lives, but he also needs to know that he has lost his true identity (drunkard parable). Nevertheless, the "gospel" reveals his identity and places him in a meaningful relationship to the Father who desires to be known and loved (father and offspring parable). The various media through which a relationship is established are not clearly expressed. The human response, however, is mentioned. Man chooses to reveal his sick condition (doctor parable) accepts some kind of purifying experience (vessel parable) and learns to value the gnosis of the Father (nightmare parable). And yet, the experience of the Divine salvation has little apparent concern with a moral change within (cf. the parable of the ignorant one) or a destiny without (cf. the parable of children from an adult). To be sure, the true Gnostic becomes part of an elect community, but the sense of a fraternal relationship is not vital. The stress of the parables falls on the relationship of the individual Gnostic to the Father (parable of the complete book)—not to his brothers. What mention there is of the brothers suggests a concern for the full complement of their elect number so that the fullness of salvation might be obtained. The person of Jesus appears in two of the parables in a distinct way. He is the shepherd who seeks the lost sheep and the physician who hastens to the one who is sick. These very parables, however, "de-mythologize" the gospel picture of Jesus and stress a subjective element — the human experience of Divine completeness.

PROPOSITION III

The writings of Justin and *Ev. Ver.* understand truth to be vitally related to Jesus' coming—his incarnation, his ministry on earth, and his death and resurrection. The emphasis in Justin's writings is largely objective. He is concerned with the historical Jesus as the fulfillment of the Old Testament prophecies. To a lesser degree he speaks of the meaning of Jesus' coming. The emphasis of *Ev. Ver.* is largely subjective. The writer is concerned with the human experience both of Jesus' person and of the work which he performed.

A. *The idea of truth in the incarnation of Jesus*

1. According to Justin

Introduction: Distinct from the Second Apology with its general theme of the persecution of Christians and their reaction to it, the main argument in the First Apology and the Dialogue turns on Jesus. The central part of the First Apology (I. 30-53) unfolds a series of predictions—of Christ's coming (I. 32) and the manner and place of his birth (I. 33-34), his suffering on the cross (I. 48-50), and his majesty at his ascension and coming in glory (I. 51-52).¹ Likewise in the Dialogue, after Justin describes his conversion (D. 1-9), and after a relatively minor part on the Jewish law (D. 10-31), he develops his argument. Christ is the fulfillment of the Old Testament prophecies (D. 32-141)—from his birth (D. 43) through his suffering on the cross (D. 86, 89-105), to his resurrection (D. 106-108) and to the rise of the Christian church (D. 109 ff.). The movement of the events is dynamic, crystalized in I. 31:7, briefly and succinctly. That is, after an account of the translation of the works of the Hebrew prophets (I. 31:1-5), by means of one sentence (I. 31:7), Justin describes the heart of the message which he finds in the books of the prophets. The sentence contains fourteen participles referring to the person and work of Christ and two participles referring to the commission given to his followers to proclaim the good news concerning Christ. To a large degree, I. 32-53 is to be understood as an expansion of this one sentence. The participles which refer to Christ and the sections of the First Apology on which they bear, are as follows:

προκηρυσσόμενον	"being heralded beforehand," I. 32.
παραγινόμενον	"as coming," I. 32.
γεννώμενον διὰ παρθένου	"born through a virgin," I. 33, place of birth, I. 34.
ἀνδρούμενον	"growing up as a man," I. 35:1.
θεραπεύοντα . . .	"healing (every disease and every sickness), and raising up the dead," I. 48:1-3.
καὶ νεκροὺς ἀνεγείροντα	
φθονούμενον	"being hated
καὶ ἀγνοούμενον	and unknown," I. 38, 49.

¹ Otto, *op. cit.*, vol. I, part I, 72, and G. Krüger, *Die Apologien Justins des Märtyrers* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1904), p. 19, observe the importance of I. 23 for the three-fold division of Justin's argument in I. 27-60. The intervening chapters (I. 24-26) present three reasons why Justin wants to demonstrate the Christian faith (πρῶτον μὲν ὅτι 24:1, δεύτερον δ' ὅτι 25:1, and τρίτον δ' ὅτι 26:1). A. W. F. Blunt, *The Apologies of Justin Martyr* (Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1911), pp. 39-41 represents the traditional attempt to integrate I. 24-26 to Justin's first argument, i.e. to what precedes.

σταυρούμενον	"being crucified
καὶ ἀποθνήσκοντα	and dying," I. 35, 40, 41:1; 48:4-5; 50.
ἀνεγειρόμενον καὶ εἰς	"being raised and going up
οὐρανοῦς ἀνερχόμενον	into the heavens," I. 41, 42:4; 45, 51.
καὶ υἱὸν θεοῦ ὄντα	"both being and having been called
καὶ κεκλημένον	Son of God."

The passage contains no participle referring to Christ's second coming but *παραγενησόμενος* does occur in I. 32:4 (cf. also I. 51-52). A similar concise sentence is found in I. 46:5 where Justin reviews anew the main events in Jesus' life—birth, naming, crucifixion, death, resurrection, and ascension. He believes fully that the "discerning man" will be able to comprehend the reason why these events occurred as they did. The prepositional phrase δι' ἣν αἰτίαν probably indicates nothing more than Justin's prophecy-fulfillment emphasis. That is, "the reason why" he was born of a virgin and died on a cross was because he had power from God to fulfill the Old Testament prophecies concerning himself (cf. likewise the breadth of the second sentence in D. 34:2).

Justin insists that the Logos became incarnate at a specific time (I. 46:1) and place (I. 34). The event is linked to the passive function of the virgin Mary and the active agency of the power or will of God. Thus, I. 32:14 says, "For through a virgin . . . through (the) power of God he was conceived," to which D. 87:2 adds, "According to the will of God, he was made flesh [σάρκοποιηθεὶς] . . . to be born a man through the virgin." Both the Dialogue and the First Apology are replete with references to Christ's birth through a virgin (cf., e.g. I. 22:5; 33:1, 4, 7; 32:14; 46:5; 54:8; 63:16; D. 23:3; 43:1, 5, 8; 45:4; 48:2; 50:1; 63:1; 75:4; 87:2; 100:2). Justin senses that the birth is linked to the old Jewish economy in several ways. First, Mary is regarded as a virgin of the family of Abraham (D. 23:3). Second, Jesus, the pre-incarnate Logos or second God is said to have appeared to Abraham before becoming man through a virgin (D. 57:3). Third, through the virgin Mary who conceived the Divine Logos, God is said to have terminated ((καταλύει) the work of the serpent whose word of disobedience Eve conceived (D. 100:5-6). This is apparently the first extra-Biblical occurrence of the comparison between Mary and Eve which became a favorite topic of later Christian writings. The comparison between the two women may be indicated in 1 Tim. 2:13-15, the crux of the passage being the phrase διὰ

τῆς τεκνογονίας in 2:15. The text may refer to the child-bearing of Mary that undid the work of Eve.¹ Archambault cites references in Irenaeus and Tertullian which compare Mary and Eve.² A comparison between the two women is likewise made in the Proto-Evangelium or Book of James (13:1) where Joseph, bitter at the discovery of Mary's pregnancy, senses that the story of Adam is repeated in him. That is, just as the serpent found Eve alone and deceived her, so, he thinks, it has happened to Mary, his betrothed.³ Perhaps more significant than any one of these three links between the birth of Jesus and the old Jewish economy is Justin's conviction that Mary's begetting was preceded by that of the Father. The Father bore his offspring (γέννημα), the Logos, before (he begat) all created things (D. 129:4). According to II, 6:3, the Son was both with him and begotten (καὶ συνὼν καὶ γεννώμενος) before the works (πρὸ τῶν ποιημάτων), "when at the beginning he created and arranged all things through him" (cf. also I. 23:2; D. 61:3; 62:4; 102:2; 128:4). In D. 76:7, the two ideas are apparently combined. A portion of the text reads, "And David moreover proclaimed that before sun and moon, he was to be born from the womb according to the will of the Father." In all probability the text links together the two aspects of generation (i.e. that of the Father and that of Mary) by blending brief phrases from two different psalms. His birth was *before time*, i.e. "before sun and moon," (= Psa. 72:5, LXX, 71:5): his birth was *in time*, i.e. "of a womb" (= Psa. 110:3, LXX, 109:3).⁴

Three features in Justin's view of the incarnation stand out for special mention.

a. Justin believes that the impregnation of Mary is due not to the Holy Spirit (as it is in Matthew and Luke), but to the δύναμις Θεοῦ. The Logos of his own power which he received from God entered Mary's womb (D. 87:2).⁵

¹ Cf. W. Lock, *op. cit.*, pp. 32-33.

² *Op. cit.*, 2, 123-125. Cf. also Otto, *op. cit.*, I, part II, 358 f.

³ A connection with Justin (D. 100:5-6) is questionable. Émile de Strycker *La forme la plus ancienne du Protévangile de Jacque* (Bruxelles: Société des Ballanlises, 1961), pp. 414-417 dates the Proto-Evangelium in the second half of the second century, thus later than Justin.

⁴ The suggestion comes from G. Archambault, *op. cit.*, 2, 12-13, against a different idea in Otto, *op. cit.*, I, part II, 274.

⁵ Goodenough, *op. cit.*, p. 237, note 5, points out the full dependence of Christ on the Father (according to Justin) in birth and in resurrection (cf. D. 100:1 with John 10:18).

b. Justin insists that the incarnation means that Christ became fully man. The text of II. 10:1, reads, "Therefore more than every human teaching ours appears greater by means of the fact that Christ has become for our sakes the entire rational (being), both body and word [λόγος] and soul."¹ The passage means that Christ did not assume merely a human body but that he became man in all three respects.

c. Justin affirms that the incarnation means that Christ was not man like others. In one sense, the blood which coursed through his veins was not human blood. No fewer than three times (I. 32:11; D. 54:1-2; 76:2) does Justin refer to the passage in Gen. 49:11, "washing his stole in the blood of (the) grape," as a Divine indication that Christ's blood was not human but of God. "For just as man has not made the blood of the vine but God (has), so also this was indicating that (his) blood was not to spring out of human seed but from (the) power of God" (I. 32:11). He means that Mary's womb was like a tube through which the Divine seed passed. As Goodenough remarks, Justin finds that, "He was a man but not with human connections."²

2. According to the writer of *Ev. Ver. Ev. Ver.* makes no reference to the virgin birth but does refer to Jesus' incarnation. Two texts (23:30-31; 26:8) refer to the body (σωμα) of Jesus, one (31:5), to his flesh (σαρξ), all three of the texts being related to the incarnation. In 23:30-31, the two Greek words ἀγάπη and σῶμα occur in a sentence which reads, "His love put a body about him," or "made him incarnate."³ The text forms the ninth strophe in the hymn on the Father's Logos (23:18-33) in which the Father is the subject, the Word, the object.⁴ This interpretation is not unchallenged. Grobel claims that the suffix of ἡντοστῆ (ten occurrences of this prepositional phrase in the hymn) refers to the "Book," and that "the Word" does not refer to Jesus the Logos.⁵ It is much more probable, however, that the suffix

¹ Thus Goodspeed, *Die ältesten Apologeten*, p. 85 (διὰ τοῦ τοῦ . . .) though ms A has τοῦτο. Gildersleeve, *op. cit.*, p. 76, following Otto, *op. cit.*, I, part I, 224 prints διὰ τοῦ.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 242.

³ Till's rendering, *seine Liebe hat sich in ihm verkörpert* in *Orientalia*, N.S., 27 (1958), 275, is preferable to the German translation in the text of *Ev. Ver.*, p. 69, i.e. *seine Liebe ist Leib auf ihm geworden*.

⁴ Cf. Till, *ibid.*, 276.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 87, note 185.

refers to the Father and that "the Word" (cf. 23:19-24, 33-35) means the Son. Two things favor this latter interpretation. First, the immediate context of $\pi\tau\omicron\omicron\tau\bar{\eta}$ in 23:19 is $\pi\omega\tau$, "the Father" (23:18). Second, the noun $\pi\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\chi\epsilon$ in 23:20 presumably has the same meaning as $\pi\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\chi\epsilon$ in 23:33-34. The latter reference must refer to Jesus. The hymn as a whole, then, can be taken as a suggestion of John 5:17-30, the Father-Son relationship. The hymn progresses from the idea of the Father's meditation on the Logos (23:18-20) to his love expressed in the incarnation of the Logos (23:30-31) and his complete trust in him ("His trust embraced him," 23:31-33). Therefore, the Logos can walk forth (cf. John 1:36; 6:66 et al.) among mankind ("the All") and show in himself the fruit of the Father's heart and the manifestation of his will (23:33-24:3). What 23:30-31 reveals then, is the incarnation of the Word (cf. John 1:1, 14) which manifests the Father's love (John 3:16). The second reference to *soma* in *Ev. Ver.* is found in 26:8. Beginning with 26:4, the text is to be rendered, "The Word [$\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\chi\epsilon$] which is in the heart of those who pronounce it, came into the Middle. It was not a sound only but it became a body. A great stir occurred among the vessels..." (26:4-10). The passage reveals no fewer than three modes of the Logos: *in experience*, i.e. "in the hearts of those who pronounce it" (26:5-6, cf. 32:16-17); *in written revelation*, i.e. "a sound" (26:7); *in appearance* or *incarnation*, i.e. "a body" (26:8). The text shows that it is the incarnation in which the decisive significance of the Logos appears. His incarnation means that judgment ($\kappa\rho\iota\varsigma\iota\epsilon$) has come forth from above to divide all the vessels (= men) in the master's (i.e. the Father's) house and to accomplish a purifying work among them (25:25-26:15). His incarnation means further that gnosis (26:23-27) and truth (26:27-32) have come and thus, Error and her offspring (26:16-23) are overcome. The connection in *Ev. Ver.* between Divine judgment and the incarnation is found also in John 12:31, "Now is the judgment of this world, now shall the ruler of this world be cast out" (RSV). Thus, when the text and context of 26:8 of *Ev. Ver.* are placed side by side with 23:30-31, the incarnation is viewed as the manifestation of Divine love and Divine judgment, a love which has the Word or Logos for its object, a judgment which performs a purifying work through the Logos in the world.

The meaning of these two references to $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ in *Ev. Ver.* (23:30-

31; 26:8), however, is qualified to some extent by another reference, referring to the *sarx* of Jesus (31:5). The sentence in which the word *sarx* occurs (31:4-9) reads as follows: "Because he came forth through a flesh, a form whose progress no one hindered because it [the form of the flesh] is Incorruptibility, Incomprehensibility." The context of the passage describes two classes of men in their relationship to Jesus Christ. First, the context refers to the Gnostics who have awakened from their nightmare existence in ignorance (30:6-14). The Holy Spirit has opened their eyes and raised them up out of their ignorance (30:14-22) and given to them the means of understanding the gnosis bestowed by the Father, even (ϠΑΥϠΑ) the manifestation of his Son (30:22-25). The Holy Spirit is said to enable them to experience the Son through all five human senses, sight, sound, taste, smell, and touch (30:26-32). To these five, a sixth sense is added—the light that the Gnostics receive which enables them to turn to God (30:36-31:1). The light comes because Jesus breathes upon them (30:34-36). The stress of the passage falls on the incarnate Christ. Allusions to the New Testament are numerous.¹ The remarkable thing is that the writer believes that there is a contemporaneity that he and other Gnostics have with the Incarnate one. No distance in time or space separates them from Jesus who came forth in the flesh. The writer senses that they can partake of the beloved Son in every way and through every sense. Second, the context describes another class of men—the *hulikoi* (ϠΥΛΗ, 31:4). They are described as strangers (31:1), as those who were not noticing his form (31:2-3), and as those who did not know him (31:3-4). Only one of the five senses is mentioned—sight. But the fact that they failed to see him indicates that through all the other senses they likewise failed to know him. Thus, they are strangers to him. But why are they unable to recognize him? The answer given is that the flesh of Jesus (31:5) is of a heavenly variety. It was flesh of a form whose passage no one could block. With considerable hesitation, Grobel compares the post-resurrection account of Jesus' coming to his assembled disciples through closed doors.² But, in view of other background from the Fourth Gospel that is present elsewhere in this context (cf. especially 30:26 ff. and 30:34-35), the text of 31:4-7 seems definitely to allude to

¹ Cf. the *Ev. Ver.* text, "notes critiques," p. 57.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 123, note 332.

John 20:19, 26. Till suggests that $\sigma\upsilon\epsilon\alpha\rho\gamma \ \bar{\eta}\varsigma\mu\alpha\tau$ possibly connotes apparent flesh, not actual, material flesh.¹ His suggestion is borne out by reason of the description which follows—i.e. the incorruptibility and incomprehensibility of the flesh (31:7-9).²

Summary and Comparison

Justin connects truth with the coming of Jesus. He affirms that the exact correspondence between prophecies of his coming and their fulfillment in time and space gives undeniable evidence of truth which the discerning man ($\delta \ \nu\omicron\upsilon\nu\epsilon\chi\eta\varsigma$) will be able to understand. The special stress which he gives to the incarnation appears in his use of the hybrid noun-verb formation, $\sigma\alpha\rho\kappa\omicron\upsilon\pi\omicron\iota\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$,³ not found in the Greek Bible nor in any other early Christian writings. His idea of the truth of the incarnation is mainly objective, i.e. it happened, though occasionally he refers to some theological truth implied in the event. Thus, for example, in D. 100:5-6, he suggests that the birth of the Logos through the virgin Mary meant the destruction of the "logos" of disobedience which the "virgin" Eve conceived from the serpent. Nevertheless, for the most part, the incarnation means for Justin that a supernatural event occurred exactly as prophesied. In contrast, the emphasis in *Ev. Ver.* is almost wholly subjective. The writer makes no connection between the incarnation and the Old Testament, gives no attention to the time or place of Jesus' birth. The three references to the "event" in *Ev. Ver.* concern the subjective truth or the meaning for life which the "event" is said to contain. On the one hand, it signifies the Father's love (23:30-31). On the other hand, for the Gnostics, the incarnation connotes the truths of a purifying judgment (25:35 ff.), of Jesus' irresistible "walk" in the world (cf. 23:33-24:7; 31:4-9)⁴ where he defeats Error (26:23-27), and of the new things in the Father's heart which Jesus teaches

¹ *Orientalia*, N.S., 27 (1958), 277.

² S. Arai, *Die Christologie des Evangelium Veritatis* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964), questions Till's rendering and suggests the translation *einen fleischlichen Gestalt* (p. 85). The difference, however, may be of minor importance. What is important is the explanatory description, i.e. the heavenly genre of Jesus' flesh—according to *Ev. Ver.*

³ Cf. I. 32:10; 66:2 (twice); D. 45:4; 84:2; 100:2.

⁴ It is probably not fortuitous that "the walk" of Jesus (23:34-35) follows closely on his incarnation (23:30-31). Cf. also 31:4-7. The verb $\epsilon\gamma\mu\alpha\alpha\gamma\epsilon$ (23:34) and the noun $\tau\epsilon\eta\mu\alpha\alpha\gamma\epsilon$ (31:6-7) are both formations

(31:9-11). The incarnation may mean more than this in *Ev. Ver.* In the light of 20:24-25 where Jesus is said to "put on" the book (= the gnostic fellowship), it is quite possible that, by the *soma* or *sarx* of Jesus, the writer perceives the true incarnation or Jesus' true flesh to be the gnostic fellowship. This means that, in contrast to Justin who stresses the truth of the objective event, the writer of *Ev. Ver.*, discontent with truth unrelated to life, "demythologizes" the event to allow the inner truth which he finds in it to stand out.

B. *The idea of truth in the life and ministry of Jesus*

I. According to Justin

a. Jesus manifests truth by his life and through his miracles. The earthly life and ministry of Jesus receive only minor attention in Justin's writings. The writer observes that even at birth Jesus was in possession of power, although he grew up like all other men (D. 88:2). He was thought to be the son of Joseph the carpenter (cf. Luke 3:23; Matth. 13:55) and himself used to make (imperf. εἰργάζετο) plows and yokes, teaching thereby the symbols of righteousness and an active life (D. 88:8). He was baptized in the Jordan for the sake of the human race (D. 88:4) and received at that time the approval of the Father through the voice from heaven (D. 88:8). In his temptation, Christ proved that he was the true Israel, "a man vanquishing power,"¹ by overthrowing the Devil who is the power called Serpent and Satan (D. 125:4). With respect to Christ's healing ministry, Justin reports that Christ had power to perform miracles, as the prophets had predicted (I. 48:1; D. 69:4-7). On several occasions, Justin compares the healing power of Aesculapius of Greek mythology to that of Christ (I. 21:2; 22:6; 25:1), or, more specifically, he says that the demons in imitation of the Old Testament prophecies concerning Christ's healing ministry, claimed like healing powers for the Homeric Aesculapius who was later deified (I. 54:10; D. 69:3). When all passages are examined, however, it must be conceded that, similar to the little space he gives to Jesus' life, Justin shows little concern with Christ's miracles. Goodenough suggests that the reason for this lies in the common phenomena of miracles

of the A₂ form of *παρῶμε* "to walk." The meaning apparently is Jesus' walk forth from the Father among the All with a possible reference to his walk back to the Father (cf. John 16:28).

¹ This is Justin's etymological explanation of the name Israel (D. 125:3).

in Justin's own day, and thus, miracles "were not adequate evidence for his divine Sonship."¹

b. Jesus manifests truth in what he taught. Justin has much more to say about Christ's teaching ministry. He says that what the Christian community speaks is true because it has learned from Christ and the prophets who preceded him (I. 23:1). Christ's teaching is true and clean (D. 35:2) and thus, those who keep his precepts are true children of God (D. 123:9). The Jew Trypho is amazed at the teachings which are found in the gospel and at Christian fidelity to them (D. 10:2). The terms which the Apologist uses most frequently to describe Jesus' teachings are the plural noun διδάγματα, "teachings" and the various forms of the verb διδάσκειν from which διδάγματα comes. There are also a few scattered references to the διδάχή (I. 40:1; II. 2:13) and to the διδασκαλία (D. 35:2; 105:1) of Christ. No fewer than seventeen references to the noun διδάγματα occur, quite evenly scattered through the Dialogue and the Apologies. Christ is termed διδάσκαλος no fewer than eight times (I. 4:7; 12:9; 15:5; 16:7 [quotation]; 19:6; 32:2; II. 8:5; D. 108:2).² Far more frequent is the verb διδάσκειν. Referring to Christ, the verb occurs mainly in the aorist tense though a few occurrences are in the perfect. The voice of the verb is nearly always active (e.g. ἐδίδαξε or διδάξαι). Where the form is passive, Christ usually appears as the active personal agent (cf. e.g. I. 12:10 τὰ δεδιδαγμένα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ πάντα). With reference to Christians, the verb occurs usually in the aorist, less frequently in the perfect and present tenses. What is significant is that in the aorist and perfect tenses, the voice of the verb in these instances is almost always passive, while in the present tense, it is active. Thus, "we were taught," and because of this, "we teach." The apparent exceptions to this observation (I. 33:5; 39:3; 50:12; D. 53:5; 118:3), i.e. references where the aorist tense and active voice are used, all refer to what the gospel writers or apostles taught. Even in these cases, however, the personal agency of Christ is not omitted (cf., e.g. I. 39:3 where the active teaching of the twelve apostles is the outgrowth of Christ's commission (ἀπεστάλησαν ὑπὸ . . . χρ. διδάξαι)).³

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 245.

² The plural form διδασκαλοι occurs thirty-one times in the Dialogue as Justin's designation of Jewish rabbinical teachers.

³ The second aorist active or perfect active forms of the verb μανθάνειν

Justin refers to two other terms that bear particularly on Christ's teachings. They are *παραδιδόναι* and *παραλαμβάνειν*. On the one hand, the verb *παραδιδόναι* describes how the Word of God has been handed down through the prophets (I. 53:6), how the apostles handed down (*παρέδωκαν*) in their memoirs the institution of the Eucharist of Jesus (I. 66:3), how Jesus handed down the way in which men should live (I. 66:1) and what should take place (D. 49:3) and what sacrifices men should offer through him (D. 117:1). In brief, Justin says that the Christian should be a keeper of the teachings which have been handed down by Christ (D. 69:7). On the other hand, the verb *παραλαμβάνειν* denotes the fact that the tradition thus handed down has been received. Thus, Justin affirms, "We have received by tradition [*παρελήφμεν*] that God has no need of material offering" (I. 10:1), and, "We have received by tradition that it is better to believe things impossible . . . than to disbelieve" (I. 19:6). A similar meaning is present in I. 4:7 and 10:2. Thus, the terms referring to the teaching of Christ, *διδάγματα* and its congeners, and the twin verbs *παραδιδόναι* and *παραλαμβάνειν* designate the Christian tradition, i.e. that which Christ handed on, which Christians have received. It is apparent that Justin is indebted to the New Testament for these terms (cf., e.g. 1 Cor. 11:23; 15:3; Gal. 1:9; 1 Thess. 2:13; 4:1; 2 Thess. 3:6, for *παραλαμβάνειν*, and Luke 1:2; Acts 6:14; 1 Cor. 11:2, 23; 15:3, for *παραδιδόναι*). H. Riesenfeld thinks that these two terms have a formal tie to both Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism. That is, he contends that the term *παραλαμβάνειν* reproduces the Hebrew *qibbēl*, the imprinting of a tradition with which one has been entrusted, while *παραδιδόναι* reflects the Hebrew *māsār*, the commitment of the tradition to a particular pupil.¹ Be this as it may, the fact remains that, by his use of the terms *παραλαμβάνειν* and *παραδιδόναι*, Justin preserves the Biblical language and meaning of tradition. This relationship of Justin to the New Testament

"to learn" express basically the same meaning as the passive forms of *διδάσκειν*, cf., e.g. I. 8:3; 13:3; 15:7; 23:1; 43:2; 59:5; 60:11.

¹ *The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings* (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Limited, 1957), pp. 17 f. Birger Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript*, trans. E. J. Sharpe (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1961), has developed Riesenfeld's view. His position has been severely criticized. Morton Smith, "A Comparison of Early Christian and Early Rabbinic Tradition," *JBL*, LXXXII, part II (June, 1963), 169-176, thinks that the New Testament shows no evidence of rabbinic mnemonic techniques and that Gerhardsson's argument constitutes "a gross anachronism" (p. 169).

enhances the basic element of truth which the Apologist finds in Jesus' teaching. So, for example, Justin contends that both baptism and the eucharist are shared by no other person than the one who believes that the things taught by the Christian community are true (I. 61:2; 66:1). He means that he and the Christian leaders contemporary with him, had received the Christian tradition handed down—intact—from the apostles and that he and his fellow Christian had inculcated this tradition—intact—upon the lives of the new converts of their time. The truth which they taught was ultimately and essentially the truth which Jesus taught.

2. According to *Ev. Ver.*

a. Like the writings of Justin, *Ev. Ver.* gives only minor attention to the earthly life of Jesus. Unlike Justin, the limited space which the writer of *Ev. Ver.* assigns to Jesus' earthly life lacks definite historical connections. Jesus comes "into the middle" (ΕΙ ΑΤΛΗΤΕ, 19:19; 26:4-5).¹ What event transpired after he came is mentioned or suggested only briefly. According to 18:21-23, he aroused anger and was persecuted. In 24:23-24, it seems likely that Jesus is the subject of the verb ΕΝΤΑΥΥΛΩ. The text thus means that Jesus served in the world. The most informative passage is 19:19 ff. The "school" to which he comes, according to this text, is probably the synagogue. The mention of the "school" sets the scene for the two groups who come to him. First, the self-esteemed wise men come. At the beginning, they tempt him (ΕΝΠΙΡΑΖΕ ΑΛΛΑΥ, 19:23), but at the end, they hate him (19:25-26). Second, the little ones come to whom the Father's gnosis belongs (19:28-30). The very paucity of the texts pertaining to an earthly ministry and the vagueness of their reference to gospel history indicate that the truth manifested in Jesus' ministry has no Palestinian roots. He came forth from the *pleroma* though being in the Father's *nous* (16:34-36). His coming into the middle, a coming synonymous with the coming of Truth (26:27-28), was to purify the Father's chosen ones and return them to him (24:6-7).

b. Like the writings of Justin, *Ev. Ver.* has more to say about Christ's teaching ministry. According to 19:19-20, teaching the

¹ It is curious that in all four occurrences of ΕΙ Α- (once ΕΙ Ε-) in *Ev. Ver.*, the object of the preposition is ΤΛΗΤΕ "the middle" (cf. 19:19; 20:8; 26:4, 27-28).

word was the first function which Jesus performed as he came to the "school." His teaching was new because he uttered those things which were in the Father's heart (31:9-11). His word was "flawless" or "without lack" (31:12-13), so powerful that it engendered life (31:15-16). He alone pronounced the Father's name (40:18-19) for he alone had the power to speak it (40:19-22). Jesus is further described as the one who came forth from the depth and uttered the Father's hidden things (40:26-28) and spoke of the place from which he came forth (40:31-34; 41:4-5).

Summary and Comparison

Justin pays little attention to the life and miracles of Jesus. As a child of his age, he is pre-eminently concerned with ethics, i.e. the teachings of Jesus.¹ In view of the fact that Jesus handed down the true way by which men should live, and in view of the faithful transmission of the tradition to the Christian fellowship, enjoyment of the privileges of this fellowship, says Justin, is dependent on a recognition of the truth found in the teachings of the Christian leaders.

Three references summarize the main importance which the writer of *Ev. Ver.* finds in the teaching of Jesus. In 30:32-34, Jesus is said to instruct men concerning the incomprehensible Father, in 18:19-21, he informs them of the way of truth, and in 19:14-20, he speaks the word of gnosis (cf. the context). These three references do not present three emphases since, according to the writer, there is a oneness to the truth found in Jesus' teaching. That truth is the gnosis of the Father's incomprehensible nature. The writer is not at all concerned as Justin is with various διδάγματα of Christ. Justin stands on the shoulders of the apostles from whom he and other Christian leaders have received the teachings of Christ essentially unchanged. The writer of *Ev. Ver.*, though writing a document that is replete with allusions to the gospels and to other parts of the New Testament, acknowledges no debt to any predecessor. He refers to no apostolic witness. There are two possible ways of explaining the fact. First, *Ev. Ver.* may be considered a hymn in which the writer identifies himself with that which he describes. That is, he becomes the mouthpiece

¹ Cf. E. de Faye, "L'Influence du Timée de Platon sur la Théologie de Justin Martyr," *Bibliothèque de L'École des hautes Études, Sciences Religieuses*, VII (1896), 176.

of the hymn. The difficulty with this view is that the document contains a basic element of reflection. Second, the writer of *Ev. Ver.* regards his own authority as adequate. The document is thus doctrine in hymnlike form. This explanation is much more satisfactory and at the same time it points to the fundamental difference between the teachings of Jesus as viewed by Justin and by the writer of *Ev. Ver.* Justin acknowledges his debt to the apostles by setting forth the teachings of Jesus in direct and indirect quotation. At times his references seem to point to a compendium or *didache* containing various logia of Christ (cf., e.g. I. 14:5 ff., D. 35:8 οἱ τῆς διδαχῆς λόγοι). At other times, he cites definitely the ἀπομνημονεύματα, "memoirs" of the apostles "called gospels" (I. 66:3; 67:3; D. 100:4; 101:3; 102:5; 104:1; 105:1, 5, 6; 106:1, 4, cf. also the verb form, i.e. οἱ ἀπομνημονεύσαντες in I. 33:5). Over against the objective emphasis, *Ev. Ver.* shows a contemplative element. The writer is satisfied to refer only briefly to Jesus as teacher and to the fact that he taught the Word and the Truth. The reason is obvious. The writer is concerned not primarily with what Jesus said, but with the meaning that the writer finds that teaching to contain for the Father's chosen ones. The writer thinks he is capable to express that meaning or to give that interpretation.

C. *The idea of truth in the passion and resurrection of Jesus*

1. According to Justin. The passion and resurrection of Jesus, for the Apologist, are events of the greatest importance for the nature of truth. Truth is found, however, in the actuality of the events more than in their meaning. In I. 23:1, the truth which Justin affirms is based, he says, on the teaching received from Christ and the prophets who preceded him. These teachings, he says, are alone true. Obviously, by the clause, "having learned from Christ and the prophets who preceded him," the writer must mean that he and his contemporaries have learned from the "memoirs" which have come down to them along with the prophetic writings which preceded them.¹ What they learned in particular from those writings was that truth was present in the death and resurrection of Jesus. Justin viewed this truth in two ways:

a. The demonic imitation of the prophecies of Jesus' death and resurrection (cf., e.g. I. 54) points to the truth of the prophecies.

¹ Cf. I. 67:3, τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν.

The imitation means that the genuine truth exists. Although Justin finds such parrotism of Christ's suffering in the demonic-inspired ancient myths, he carefully observes that the particular type of suffering—the cross—forms an exception to the demonic mimicry. Justin thinks that the demons failed to understand the cross since all things about it were expressed by the prophets in symbolic form (I. 55:1).

b. The minute fulfillment of the prophetic word in the events of the passion and resurrection of Jesus constitutes the greatest and truest evidence (ἀπόδειξις) of the events themselves (cf. I. 30:1). It is this apodictic element which one must bear in mind in making an overall assessment of Justin's particular stress on the death and resurrection of Jesus. Purely from the frequency of their occurrence, ἀπόδειξις, "demonstration, proof," and its congeners command attention.¹ Other related terms that appear often are ἐξήγησις (ἐξηγεῖσθαι) σημεῖον (σημαίνειν), (προ) κηρύσσειν, εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, δηλοῦν, and μνησκειν. Whatever the term may be, Justin utilizes it to prove the truth concerning the death and resurrection of Jesus. According to I. 13:3, the writer's forthcoming proof will show why Christians give second place in the Godhead to Jesus Christ, Son of God, crucified in the days of Pontius Pilate in the time of Tiberius Caesar. It is this proof which he develops especially in I. 30-53. The same apodictic element on the passion and resurrection occupies a great deal of space in the Dialogue. Trypho vigorously objects to the crucifixion (D. 32:1), finding Justin's teaching on the subject blasphemous (D. 38:1). He states that, according to the law (Deut. 21:23), crucifixion is an accursed death (D. 89:2). To all of these objections, Justin sets forth the proof—Christ's death and resurrection occurred in exact accord with the Old Testament prophecies, i.e. predictions and types. An admirable illustration is D. 86 where, from the Jewish law, the prophets, and the writings, Justin cites various "trees" and "rods" which prefigure the cross of Jesus (cf. also D. 90). In his sustained exegesis of Psalm 22 (LXX, 21), Justin finds the theme of the cross and resurrection combined together (D. 98-106). What Justin says in all of his exegetical argument is that the death and resurrection of Jesus are true because they occurred precisely

¹ E. J. Goodspeed, *Index Apologeticus* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung, 1912), pp. 30-31, lists well over 150 occurrences of noun and verb forms, the vast majority of these references being found in the Dialogue.

in the way the prophetic Spirit indicated. The question now arises, does Justin sense that there is an inner truth in Jesus' passion and resurrection? That is, does he express the meaning as well as the factuality of these events? To answer the question, attention needs to be given to Justin's idea of the cross—its relation to men and their redemption.

(1) The cross and the cosmos. Both I. 55 and 60 attempt to show the cosmic significance of the cross. Goodenough cites these chapters as indicating "the cosmic significance of the Logos."¹ It must be remembered, however, that the cross—not the Logos—is the central subject of these chapters. Reference has been made above to I. 55 and the "power" that Justin finds in the cross. He senses that all things in the world are ordered by this σχῆμα or form (I. 55:2), including man himself (I. 55:4). The fact that the cross is symbolized everywhere shows its true cosmic power. In I. 60, the writer's argument is even more inclusive. From Plato's *Timaeus* (36 B, C), Justin claims that the χῖ or cross which the demiurge constructs after splitting all things into two parts, is a borrowing from Moses.² The text which Plato is said to have borrowed, comes from Num. 21:8-9 where Moses obeys God and places a bronze serpent upon a standard (σημεῖον) so that those who were bitten by the deadly serpents might live.

LXX (Num. 21:9a)

καὶ ἐποίησεν Μωϋσῆς ὄφιν χαλκοῦν καὶ
ἔστησεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ σημείου. . .

Apol. I. 60:3

. . . λαβεῖν τὸν Μωϋσέα χαλκὸν καὶ
ποιῆσαι τύπον σταυροῦ καὶ τοῦτον
στῆσαι ἐπὶ τῇ ἀγίᾳ σκηνῇ. . .

Justin's text contains three significant changes from the LXX. First, he omits any mention of the object, i.e. the brass serpent (ὄφιν χάλκεος in the LXX), which Moses made. Second, Justin has a significant addition. What Moses made, he says, was a type of the cross (τύπος σταυροῦ). The word τύπος occurs in the next sentence of Justin also where the Apologist cites Moses' command to the people, "If you look upon this type and believe, you shall be saved by it." The third change is the most important. According to Justin, Moses "made a type of the cross and placed this" ἐπὶ τῇ ἀγίᾳ σκηνῇ. The change from the LXX reading ἐπὶ σημείου,

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 159, but cf. also pp. 159-161.

² Cf. *The Loeb Classical Library*, "Plato," VII, 68-72.

“upon a standard,” το ἐπὶ τῇ ἁγίᾳ σκηνῇ is purposeful.¹ Justin senses that Plato’s $\chi\tau$ in the cosmos occupies the same central position as the cross on the tabernacle, the tabernacle being here a type of the cosmos. Far beyond the mere factuality of the cross, Justin is affirming in both I. 55 and 60 that the cross performs a life-giving function for the cosmos.

(2) The cross and redemption. From the standpoint of Justin’s vocabulary of redemption, the noun ἀγάπη, so prominent in the Johannine and Pauline writings, occurs twice only (one of the two times in quotation); the verb ἀγαπᾶν is generally found in quotation only (cf., e.g. D. 38:4; 56:14; 63:4; I. 15:9).² The twin term of ἀγάπη, i.e. χάρις, occurs much more frequently. The emphasis, however, is not on God’s grace in redemption *per se* but on the enlightenment or wisdom or knowledge that Christians receive from God. Except for II. 13:6, all of the references to χάρις occur in the Dialogue (cf., e.g. D. 30:1; 32:5; 58:1; 78:10-11; 92:1; 100:2). The words ἀπαλλάσσειν-ἀπαλλαγῇ, “to set free-ransom,” have a redemptive meaning in only three passages (I. 12:2; II. 14:1; D. 100:6). Terms such as πάσχειν - πάθος - παθητός are frequently used with reference to Christ (cf., e.g. I. 22:4; 51:1; 52:3; 63:16; II. 13:4; D. 34:2; 49:2; 67:6; 93:2). They should be considered in close connection with the terms σταυροῦν - σταυρός and with the many references to σύμβολον (cf., e.g. D. 14:2; 40:3; 53:4; 78:6; 90:5; 111:1) and to τύπος (cf., e.g. D. 40:1; 41:1, 4; 91:2, 3, 4; 114:1; 131:4). The terms as their context shows, refer more to the factuality of Christ’s suffering than to the soteriological meaning which those sufferings contain. The same holds true for the verb σώζειν and its congeners. Quite apart from numerous references in quotation, the terms σώζειν and σωτηρία occur with great frequency, especially in the Dialogue. Salvation is viewed as a struggle

¹ The preposition ἐπὶ with the dative has a local sense in this text, meaning “upon.” Otto’s Latin translation, *sancto tabernaculo*, “in the holy tabernacle,” does not do justice to Justin’s text (cf. Otto, *op. cit.*, vol. I, part I, 161). In the light of the comparison made to the text of the *Timaean*, i.e. Ἐχίασεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ παντὶ (I. 60:1), one might expect Justin to write ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ σκηνῇ. However, the command given through Moses was for dying men to look upon a visible brass serpent (cf. Num. 21:9). If visible, therefore, it could not be “in” the tabernacle. Justin’s text is apparently a conflation of the LXX (the prep. ἐπὶ) and the *Timaean* (“upon the holy tent” = the τὸ πᾶν of the *Timaean*—not the “standard” of the LXX).

² P. E. Huth, *Justin Martyr: esquisse historique* (Geneva: J. G. Fick, 1893), p. 81, criticizes the Apologist for this lack.

(D. 142:2), a calling of the Father (D. 131:2), a look of faith as in the case of the Israelites who looked upon the brass serpent (D. 112:1; cf. 91:4; 94:1; I. 60:3), a deliverance from evil deeds = the fangs of the serpent (D. 94:2), and a reward for those who do acceptable deeds (D. 94:5; cf. D. 46:4; 105:6; 45:3). The fullness of this salvation is to be realized at Christ's second coming (I. 65:1; D. 45:4; 47:1, 4; 35:8). In all of these references the main appeal is to the fact that Christ suffered and to the moral enlightenment man receives through the cross and/or to man's future share in God's salvation. It is the strong moralistic note which Justin sounds that has led various scholars to suspect the Apologist of rationalizing the teaching of redemption.¹ "According to their view," says Goodenough, "Justin teaches that Christ gave light and information. He destroyed the demonic influence, increased the true knowledge of man, and so made it possible for men to purify themselves by choosing the higher life . . . There is no change in the relationship of God to man in a forgiveness of sin. Only is there change on the part of those men who choose to claim their kinship with God and to use the latent power that is in them."² In one sense, Goodenough dissociates himself from this view. He thinks that von Engelhardt, in particular, fails to sense the active power in redemption which Justin discerns and finds that Justin represents salvation as knowledge.³ For his own part, however, Goodenough thinks that there is little indication in Justin's writings of any *present* redemption.⁴ He says, "The kingdom in Justin is of course always eschatological."⁵ And again, he affirms, "The operation of grace [according to Justin] which cleanses the soul from sin is a preparation for that salvation which is not received until the judgment day."⁶ G. T. Purves earlier had expressed the same idea. He formulates Justin's view of salvation as follows: "The Christian is not so much a saved man as one who hopes to be saved through belief in Christ's teaching, baptism for the

¹ A. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, trans. from the 3rd German ed., II (New York: Russell & Russell, 1958), 169-177, says that while no Apologist omitted entirely the idea of redemption, yet Christianity was to the Apologists generally a doctrine of reason, freedom, and morality.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 253 f.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 254.

⁴ *Ibid.*, especially pp. 250 ff.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 251, note 2.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 250.

remission of past sins, and subsequent obedience. Faith is belief in the truth of Christ's word rather than the acceptance of a finished redemption; and with it not merely repentance but obedience is joined as the condition of obtaining the future reward."¹

There is a decided element of truth in these statements, but, it may be asked, do they give the proper balance that is found in Justin's writings?² Goodenough, in supporting his view that salvation in Justin's writings is eschatological (i.e. future), asserts that D. 111:4 gives evidence. Goodenough thinks that the context of σώζονται in the text means that those who were once fornicators and unrighteous "are to be saved."³ The context to which he probably refers is D. 111:3 where the future tense of ῥύεσθαι occurs. The text reads, "Thus also the blood of Christ will deliver from death those who have believed." Both the wider and nearer contexts, however, need to be considered. Is it not possible that Justin applies exactly his type to the antitype? The blood of the passover lamb in Egypt delivered the Israelites at the hour when physical death threatened; so the blood of Christ will deliver believers at the hour of physical death. If the wider context be observed, there is no necessity to allow the future form ῥύσεται to control the meaning of σώζονται. It should be observed also that σώζονται is linked closely to the following aorist participle, λαβόντες (D. 111:4). As for the nearer context, Justin places the salvation of Gentile Christians in the framework of the incident of Rahab and the spies. In the New Testament, both Rahab's faith (Hebr. 11:31) and her works (Jas. 2:25) are cited. Justin's use of the incident is different. Like the life of Rahab (cf. Josh. 2:1 ff.; 6:17, 23, 25), the immoral one (ἡ πόρνη), the Gentile Christians once lived in immorality (οἱ πάλαι πόρνοι). Their salvation, however, is like to that of the Jewish spies sent by Joshua to spy out Jericho. The spies were delivered by means of the symbol of the scarlet cord (τὸ σύμβολον τοῦ κοκκίνου σπαρτίου): the Gentile Christians are being saved (σώζονται) by the symbol of the blood of Christ. In this connection, the text of I. 14:2 may be cited. It reads, "We who formerly were rejoicing in fornication . . . now embrace self-control only . . ." The text compares favorably with D. 111:4

¹ *The Testimony of Justin Martyr to Early Christianity* (New York: Anson D. F. Randolph and Company, 1889), pp. 163 f.

² The place of faith in Justin's writings will be considered in proposition IV.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 251, note 1.

in three ways. First, both texts use the adverb *πάλαι* to describe a former life in paganism. Second, both use a noun form from the verb *πορνεύειν* to describe the immorality which that former life involved. Third, both texts indicate that a change has occurred—the old life has given way to the new. D. 64:3 is another important text. The writer affirms that the ones who are being saved (*οἱ σωζόμενοι*) of the Jewish nation, “are being saved through This One” and “are in the portion of This One.” There is nothing future about the text. Like D. 111:4, the verb *σώζειν* occurs in the present tense. In both texts, the verb is probably present in meaning.

The outstanding passage in Justin’s works dealing with redemption through the cross is D. 94-95. The writer compares the serpent on the “sign”¹ *σημεῖον* (Num. 21:8-9) with Christ on the cross (cf. John 3:14-15; Gal. 3:13).² J. Rivière thinks that the newness in Justin’s doctrine of Christ’s death is to be found in a penal expiation theory, and that D. 95 is the most formal passage in Justin on this issue.³ Archambault assumes that D. 95 contains in a new and precise form the ideas which the letter to the Hebrews expresses in germ form.⁴ In its context, the passage answers the Jewish accusation that Christ was crucified as an enemy of God, “cursed by him” (D. 93:4), while it sets the scene for the prolonged exegesis of Psalm 22 (D. 97-106). The following points show the main ideas in Justin’s exegesis in D. 94-96.

(a) A definite connection exists between the death of Christ and both the work of the Devil which occasioned Adam’s transgression and the various evil practices of men (D. 94:2).

(b) Every nation is under a curse for failure to keep the law, both Jews, and—to a greater degree—Gentiles (D. 95:1).

(c) The work of Christ through the cross, on the one hand, destroys the work of the Devil, and, on the other hand, bestows salvation on those who believe, a salvation from their evil deeds of many kinds (D. 94:2).

¹ Evidently Justin views the pole on which the serpent was placed as cruciform. On the other hand, *σημεῖον* is the word used in the LXX.

² The text is another indication of Justin’s use of the Fourth Gospel (cf. I. 61:3-5). He also seems to have known Galatians. His argument includes the same two texts from Deut. (27:26; 21:23) which Paul employs in Gal. 3:10, 13.

³ *Le dogme de la Rédemption* (Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, 1905), p. 115.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, 2, 103 f., note 2.

(d) The righteous character of God appears in both type and antitype. That is, the God who commanded his people through Moses not to make any graven image at any time and yet who commanded this same Moses to make a brass serpent and put it on a standard at a given time, is the same righteous God who pronounced every one cursed who hangs on a tree, and yet who caused his Christ at a given time to suffer on a tree and take upon himself there the curses of all men (D. 95:2-3; 96:1).

(e) The work of Christ on the cross was followed by his resurrection (D. 95:2).

It can hardly be doubted that some idea of substitution is present in the passage.¹ On the whole, Justin's argument is quite intelligible though Goodenough feels it could have been more complete.² With this text, Rivière compares other texts in Justin's works where he presents Christ as Redeemer because he defends us against demons (D. 30:3; 41:1; 45:4), saves men through his passion (D. 74:3), regenerates men through his cross (D. 138:2) at the price of his blood (D. 134:5).³ And, to these references, one may add the repeated use which the Apologist makes of typology in Old Testament passages referring to animal sacrifices (e.g. the passover lamb, D. 40:1-3; 111:3, the two goats, D. 40:4-5; 111:1) and his frequent appeal to the Messianic texts that stress sacrifice (e.g. Isa. 52:13-53:12 in I. 50:2-11; 51:1-5; D. 13:2-7; 42:2; 97:2; 114:2; 118:1 et al., and Psalm 22 in D. 97-106).

As for the resurrection of Christ, Justin says that it is prophesied in the Old Testament just as his death was prophesied. The references show that while, on the one hand, his resurrection is connected with his death, on the other hand, it is intimately linked with his ascension (cf., e.g. I. 42:4; 46:5; D. 85:1, 2; 32:3). As with Jesus' death, so with his resurrection, the evidential stress is strong. In one sense, however, the resurrection of Jesus holds for Justin an important redemptive value. That value lies in the day in which it occurred. In concluding his description of the weekly worship service of Christians (I. 67), Justin observes that the worship occurs on Sunday for (ἐπειδή) two reasons; it is the day in which

¹ Cf. J. Rivière, *op. cit.*, p. 115. Cf. also A. Lukyn Williams, *Justin Martyr, the Dialogue with Trypho* (London: S. P. C. K., 1930), p. 201, note one, "J. believed in a kind of vicarious atonement."

² *Op. cit.*, p. 260.

³ J. Rivière, *op. cit.*, p. 114.

God made the world, and the day in which "Jesus Christ our Savior" arose from the dead (I. 67:8). The writer's labored description of the name Sunday (ἡ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένη ἡμέρα in I. 67:3 and ἡ δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου ἡμέρα in I. 67:8) has apparently a dual purpose. First, in avoiding the technical description ἡ κυριακὴ ἡμέρα (cf. Rev. 1:10), Justin avoids a term which the pagan world would have found obscure or misleading.¹ Second, by the use of the participle λεγομένη (I. 67:3), he avoids the possible misconception that Christians worship the sun.² But beyond the mere description of the day, a redemptive note is sounded by associating the rising of Jesus Christ from the dead with the activity of God on the first day of creation (Gen. 1:1-5). The significance of the day lies in these two events; it is the day in which God made the world and the day in which Christ arose from the dead. By connecting the resurrection of Jesus to the work of creation, Justin singles out the importance of the Easter event. Essentially he says that as creation reflects the work of God (through his Logos), so the resurrection is the work of Jesus Christ. The contrast which Justin's idea forms to New Testament theology on this point becomes clear by an examination of the terms ἐγείρειν and ἀναστῆναι and their congeners. First, ἐγείρειν in reference to Christ's resurrection is common in the New Testament (over thirty references), rare in Justin's works (only in D. 108:2 though ἀνεγείρειν occurs in I. 31:7; D. 106:1). In the New Testament, aside from two references in John (2:19, 20), all of the texts show or imply that God is the subject of the action, whether the verb is active or passive in voice. In this way, the New Testament presents the resurrection of Jesus as God's special work through which he becomes known.³ Second, the classical term ἀναστῆναι

¹ Cf. T. G. Jalland, "Justin Martyr and the President of the Eucharist," *Texte und Untersuchungen* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962), Band 80, 83-85. Jalland thinks that the technical term is avoided here just as the technical term ἐπίσκοπος is avoided in this same chapter (I. 67:6) by the use of the innocuous προεστώς. Purves, *op. cit.*, pp. 261 ff., much earlier, expressed serious doubts as to this explanation for προεστώς since Justin makes free use of technical terms such as "deacons" and "regeneration."

² Thus Otto, *op. cit.*, vol. I, part I, 184b says, *Itaque Iustinus vocem λεγομένην [sic!] addit, omnem ut superstitionis suspicionem evitet.*

³ Thus A. Oepke in *TWNT*, II, article on ἐγείρω, ἔγειρος, ἐξεγείρω, γρηγορέω (ἀγρυπνέω), 334 (cf. also I, 371). Oepke observes the exceptions to this general sense in John 2:19, 21 [sic! for 20], 10:17, 18, as the first expression of the idea of Jesus' spontaneous resurrection. Apart from the fact that in John 10:17, 18, a different verb is used (i.e. λαβεῖν), Oepke fails to note

is frequent in Justin's writings, infrequent in the New Testament except for Luke, the "classical" writer of literary Koine.¹ Third, the New Testament emphasis, whether in ἐγείρειν or ἀναστῆναι falls on the activity or power of God. In Justin's writings, the almost exclusive use of ἀναστῆναι instead of ἐγείρειν, and the fact that Jesus is almost always the subject of the action of the verb (i.e. "He arose"), points to what Oepke describes as *der Gedanke der selbsttätigen Auferstehung Jesu*.² The question still remains as to the real meaning of the day of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Justin views the day not only as the *first* but also as the *eighth* day (D. 41:4). The Jewish rite of circumcision took place on the eighth day (cf. Gen. 17:12). This, says Justin, is the type of the true Christian circumcision, a circumcision by which Jesus Christ who arose on the first day after the sabbath (= the eighth day), removes deceit and evil from Christians. Therefore, he affirms, the eighth day possessed a μυστήριον which the seventh day did not have (D. 24:1). The meaning of the eighth day is further observed in the salvation of the eight persons through the flood (D. 138:1-2).

2. According to the writer of *Ev. Ver.* In *Ev. Ver.*, the death and "resurrection"³ of Jesus point to the truth of the Father's nature. In sharp contrast to Justin's writings, *Ev. Ver.* is concerned neither with the New Testament historical account of the cross and the resurrection nor with the background of these events in the Old Testament, but with the underlying meaning which the "events" contain. *Ev. Ver.* reveals a docetic element in relation to both of these "events." The cross means the patience of Jesus which unfolds the gnosis of the Father: the "resurrection" of Jesus connotes the incorruptibility which he assumes and in which the Gnostics share. From the very opening page of *Ev. Ver.*, one perceives that this is a "gospel," or a "salvation" document,

that, even granted the presence of "Johannine theology" in John 2:19-20, John shows in the same context (John 2:22 ὅτε οὖν ἠγγέθη ἐκ νεκρῶν) that he is in agreement with the general Synoptic and New Testament use of ἐγείρειν with reference to Jesus' resurrection.

¹ In Acts generally, the subject of the verb is God (cf. Acts 2:24, 32; 13:33-34; 17:31). Elsewhere the verb is either neutral (cf. Mark 9:10, τὸ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆναι) or has Jesus for its subject (cf. Mark 9:9, 31; 10:34; Luke 18:33; 24:7; John 20:9; Acts 10:41; 17:3; 1 Thess. 4:14).

² *TWNT*, II, 334.

³ The reason for the quotation marks will be apparent later. *Ev. Ver.* teaches no bodily resurrection of Jesus. It contains only a passing reference to what may be termed his "metaphysical resurrection."

presenting the work of Jesus as its central feature. The opening sentence of the document apparently does not end until 17:4 (with the prepositional phrase $\overline{\text{ncw}}\text{c}$).¹ In a significant way, *Ev. Ver.* begins where the gospels of Matthew (cf. 1:21) and Luke (cf. 1:31; 2:11) begin—with the announcement of the “saving” work of Jesus. He is called Savior (ncwtpr , 16:38) for he was to carry out the work of redeeming (apcwtc , 16:39) those who were ignorant of the Father. Like the canonical gospels, *Ev. Ver.* unfolds the “act” of redemption through the death of Jesus. The writer evidences no polemical trait, no desire to correct the gospel tradition. He does intend, however, to give a more profound interpretation of the gospel.² Whatever the act of redemption will mean for the Savior, the writer senses that the work of the Savior will be oriented towards the particular problem of man’s ignorance of the Father (16:39-17:1).

a. The first mention of the sufferings and death of Jesus in *Ev. Ver.* is found on Plate 18. The movement of the passage shows that through the compassions of the Father the gospel is manifested to the complete ones, i.e. the elect (18:11-15), that Jesus Christ, the agent of the gospel, teaches men the way of truth (18:15-21), and, that he is crucified for doing so (18:21-24). The central clause is awactc awce ,³ “He was nailed to [a piece of] wood” (18:24). Error is said to have caused his death, the same Error that imprisoned men in a material existence (17:34-36). The reason why Error has Jesus crucified is because he taught men the way of Truth (18:19-21). The text suggests the basic situation in Jesus’ life, according to the canonical gospels. That is, the Jewish authorities did not like what Jesus taught and, accordingly, determined to destroy him (Mark 12:12; Matt. 21:45 f., Luke 20:19; John 10:30 f.). Doubtless the writer views the cross as historical, historical, however, to others. Its historicity is not important to him. Thus, he gives no names of persons or places relating to Jesus’ crucifixion, affirming only that Christ achieves something by his crucifixion. According to 18:24-26, when nailed to wood, he became a fruit

¹ Only Schenke, *op. cit.*, p. 33, among the main translators of *Ev. Ver.* punctuates the sentence differently.

² Cf. A. Guillaumont in his review of the published text of *Ev. Ver.* in *RHR*, 153 (1958), 251.

³ The clause (cf. also 20:25) contains the idiomatic passive in Coptic where the subject is unexpressed. Cf. W.C. Till, *Koptische Grammatik* (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1955), pp. 165 f., § 326.*

of the Father's gnosis. The text contrasts with Irenaeus' description of the Valentinian *pleroma*. In that *pleroma*, Jesus is said to be the perfect fruit¹ a being skilfully blended of great beauty extracted from all the Aeons. The picture in *Ev. Ver.* is quite different. The writer says that Jesus is a fruit of the tree, i.e. the cross. Since fruit is intended to be eaten, men eat the fruit of the cross. The meaning apparently is as follows:

(1) They share in the gnosis of the Father (= the Gnostics eat the fruit of the tree). The background is probably the imagery of John 12:24 and Rev. 22:2. Taken together, these two Biblical references point to the source of fruit, i.e. the tree of crucifixion (John) and to its unfailing supply (Rev., "every month"). The writer of *Ev. Ver.* is saying a similar thing, for the fruit "did not perish because they ate it" (18:26-27). Therefore, men share in the Father's gnosis through the cross.

(2) They experience joy in the discovery of the Father's gnosis. It is significant that, according to the very first sentence of *Ev. Ver.* (16:31-17:4), joy appears as the hallmark of the discovery of the gospel. Just what "the discovery" (*ἡ ἀκρίβεια*) is, the writer reveals in a third part of the fruit of the cross.

(3) They share in God himself. "They were found in him and he was found in them" (18:29-31). One can hardly miss the suggestion of John 14:23. Basically the "discovery" contains nothing new. That the elect are in the Father and the Father in them has always been true, according to *Ev. Ver.* The fact, however, becomes a "discovery" through the crucifixion of Jesus. Now men discover their true status. The death of Jesus brings to light the place that men already occupy—in the Father. The text gives a certain depth to the meaning of the cross, but at the same time, it subtracts from the newness of the Divine act. Justin's writings seriously reduce the meaning of the cross by stressing the minutiae of detail to be found in predictions and types. *Ev. Ver.* reduces the meaning of the cross by making it the manifestation of what is already true, much like the unveiling of a work of art (the work has already been completed before it is unveiled). With the death of Jesus, men discover that they really are in the Father and the Father in them. The veil of ignorance is removed and the gnosis of the Father becomes manifest.

¹ *Adv. H.*, I. 2:6, τέλειον καρπὸν or *perfectum fructum*, Harvey, *op. cit.*, I, 23.

b. A second indication of the passion of Jesus is found in 20:3-14. Jesus is described as "the one who would be sacrificed," $\overline{\text{n}}\overline{\text{c}}\overline{\text{e}}\overline{\text{g}}\overline{\text{a}}\overline{\text{g}}\overline{\text{w}}\overline{\text{a}}\overline{\text{q}}$ (20:5-6). The text reflects the imagery of Rev. 5:6 (also 5:12; 13:8).¹ Once again, the writer suggests that there is historical significance to the work of Jesus. He observes that neither the Father nor his chosen ones were known—until the cross (20:6-9). Schenke thinks that 19:34-20:3 and 20:3-9 contain two different ideas which the writer fails to resolve, i.e. the book becomes manifest *during the preaching* of Jesus, and the book does not become manifest *until the death* of Jesus.² It is doubtful, however, if the problem exists. The difference between the two sections is that of the inner (19:34-20:3) v.s. the outer (20:3-9) manifestation of the living book. The imagery of Rev. 5 again appears.³ During the ministry of Jesus there were faint intimations of the purpose of God. Thus "the living book of the ones who live did become manifest" in the hearts of the little ones (19:34-36). The full manifestation of the book, however, is indicated only in 20:8-9 by the contrary to fact or unreal condition, "if that book had not come into the midst."⁴ So, with the death of Jesus, God's purpose becomes clear to the world at large. In this sense, the writer's idea of the book approximates the meaning of the "book" in Revelation 5, concerning which R. H. Charles writes, "The roll contains the divine decrees and the destinies of the world. It deals with the things $\alpha \mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota \gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$." ⁵ The difference lies in the fact that the book, in *Ev. Ver.*, concerns the elect; in Revelation 5, it concerns the world. In the case of either book, however, the work of Jesus is indispensable. No one can take the book except Jesus alone (20:3-6, cf. Rev. 5:3-5). This is why ($\epsilon\tau\epsilon\epsilon \pi\epsilon\epsilon\iota$), the writer says, that Jesus, the merciful and faithful one, showed himself patient by accepting the sufferings, so that he might take ($\rho\alpha\overline{\text{h}}\overline{\text{t}}\overline{\text{e}}\overline{\text{y}}\overline{\text{y}}\overline{\text{y}}$) that book, since he knows that his death is life for many (20:10-14).

¹ According to the Bohairic text of G. Horner's, *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect*, IV (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905), 474, Rev. 5:6 contains the same descriptive word as *Ev. Ver.* The Bohairic reads $\epsilon\sigma\tau\overline{\text{g}}\overline{\text{h}}\overline{\text{h}} \epsilon\sigma\tau\overline{\text{g}}\overline{\text{h}} \epsilon\tau\overline{\text{a}}\overline{\text{t}}\overline{\text{h}} \epsilon\gamma\overline{\text{z}}\overline{\text{e}}\overline{\text{a}}\overline{\text{z}}\overline{\text{w}}\overline{\text{a}}\overline{\text{h}}$.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 36, note 1a.

³ Cf. Rev. 5:1 $\beta\iota\beta\lambda\iota\omicron\nu \gamma\epsilon\gamma\overline{\text{r}}\overline{\text{a}}\overline{\text{m}}\overline{\text{m}}\overline{\text{e}}\overline{\text{n}}\overline{\text{o}}\overline{\text{n}} \xi\sigma\omega\theta\epsilon\nu \kappa\alpha\iota \theta\pi\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu$.

⁴ Till, *Koptische Grammatik*, p. 222, cites a similar construction in John 15:22, i.e. in the Coptic version.

⁵ *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920), I, 138.

The writer's knowledge of the New Testament is seen in his description of Jesus as "merciful and faithful" (cf. Hebr. 2:17), and, as patient in suffering (cf. Hebr. 12:2-3). He endures in order to fulfill a double goal¹—to take the book (= to die, cf. 20:5-6², 12-13), and to give life to many (20:13-14).

c. A third indication of the meaning of the death of Jesus is present in the parable of the deed of the deceased householder (20:14-20). The parable describes truth as the manifestation of the Divine hiddenness and is to be rendered as follows:

"Just as in the case of an unopened deed, the substance of the deceased householder remains hidden, so also the All continued to remain hidden while the Father of the All was [ō] invisible.³ This one [i.e. the Father] is completely unique in himself from whom every path [ⲙⲁⲉⲓⲧ i.e. to gnosis] comes."

"The parable concerns a deed (ⲁⲓⲁⲑⲏⲕⲏ, 20:15) and is closely connected with the preceding (19:34-20:14) and following (20:20-

¹ It seems likely that ⲡⲁⲛⲧ- (= ⲱⲡⲁⲛⲧ-) has the idea of purpose, representing possibly a *ῥα* or *ὅπως* in the lost Greek original. Admittedly, most translations understand ⲡⲁⲛⲧ- in a temporal sense, i.e. "until" (thus Grobel, *op. cit.*, p. 62; Isenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 148). Likewise Till, *ZNTW*, 50 (1959), 171, Schenke, *op. cit.*, p. 36, and the German translation in the *Ev. Ver.* text, p. 66, render by *bis*, while the French translation of the same text, p. 11, has *jusqu'à*. The idea of purpose, however, may occasionally be present in ⲡⲁⲛⲧ- though it is less frequent. G. Steindorff, *Lehrbuch der Koptischen Grammatik* (Chicago: University Press, 1951), p. 175, § 373, renders ⲱⲡⲁⲛⲧⲉ by *bis* or *bis dass*, while J. M. Plumley, *An Introductory Coptic Grammar* (London: Home & van Thal, 1948), p. 103, § 223, mentions no other sense than "until." But for the sense of purpose, cf. W. Till, *Koptische Grammatik*, pp. 158 f., § 312, the examples cited by Crum, *A Coptic Dictionary*, p. 573a, and the clear example found in the Bohairic version of Gal. 1:4 (ⲱⲡⲁⲧⲉⲛⲁⲣⲁⲙⲉⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ = ὅπως ἐξέλθῃται ἡμᾶς). An idea of purpose for *Ev. Ver.* 20:12 is supported by the context of the passage which speaks of the determinative knowledge of Jesus (cf. the form ⲱⲡⲁⲧⲏⲉ in 20:13).

² The causal conjunction ⲉⲡⲓⲁⲛ (20:13) introduces the clause containing the words ⲡⲓⲕⲟⲩ ⲛⲧⲟⲩⲧⲉ̅̅̅, "his death." The conjunction suggests that the words "to take the book" mean "to die." The same connection is evident in 20:5-6 in the use of the conjunctive tense ⲛⲉⲣⲟⲗⲟⲱⲗⲉ̅̅̅ which follows immediately the future ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲏⲁⲩⲧⲉ̅̅̅ (20:5). Cf. Plumley, *op. cit.*, pp. 104 f., § 226, and W. Till, *Koptische Grammatik*, p. 163 § 322* on the use of the conjunctive after the future.

³ The first sentence closes with the borrowed Greek word ⲛⲁⲣⲟⲣⲁⲧⲟⲥ in 20:20. Cf. Till, *ZNTW*, 50 (1959), p. 171.

21:2) context. The deed is the living book, a book previously known to the Father which Jesus alone by his suffering and death takes and makes manifest. The clause which describes the living book (20:8-9, "if that book had not come into the midst") finds its parallel in 20:15-16, "a deed not yet opened." Despite Grobel's claim that the parable is obscure,¹ the meaning seems fairly clear. The four parts to the parable and the application of each part may be set forth as follows:

<i>Parable</i>	<i>Application</i>
1. A deed remains unopened (20:15-16, ΕΛΠΑΤΟΥΗΗ for ΕΛΠΑΤΟΥΟΥΗΗ).	1. The Father is invisible (20:19-20, ὅ is the qual. of ειρε).
2. Thus, the inheritance (ΟΥΣΙΑ) remains hidden (20:16-17).	2. Thus, the All remained hidden (20:18-19).
3. The householder dies (20:17).	3. Jesus dies (implied, but cf. 20:13-14).
4. The deed is opened and the inheritance becomes manifest (implied).	4. The Father and his inheritance become manifest (implied, but cf. 20:6-9, 25-27).

In brief, the passage affirms that, by his death, Jesus manifests the hiddenness both of the Father and of the All (cf. **ἀόρατος** in Col. 1:15 and the parallel idea found in John 1:18). The mediatorial work of Jesus is evident. If by "path" the writer means "path to gnosis" as Till has suggested,² then the redemptive work of Jesus is seen to be the work of bringing gnosis (cf. 16:37-17:1).

d. A fourth section dealing with Jesus' redemptive death contains the suggestive emphasis on the book, the Father's testamentary will, and the cross (20:22-28). The section is unique in that it contains the sole text in *Ev. Ver.* that uses the word "cross" **ϝϝοϝ**, 20:27). The prepositional phrase, **ετβε νεει** (20:22-23), "therefore," shows how closely the passage is joined to the preceding context (cf. 20:10 for the same phrase). The four, first perfect verbs all have **ι̅η̅ς** "Jesus" (20:24) for their subject, and all have the same "event" in view—the death of Jesus. That is, his death was the occasion when he became manifest (**αγοταν̅ α̅βαλ**, 20:23), when he donned (**αψαλεψ**, 20:24) the book, when he was nailed to a tree (**αταγτψ α̅ψυε**, 20:25), and when he publicly

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 63, note 110.

² *ZNTW*, 50 (1959), 171.

placarded the Father's testamentary will (αἰτωσε παταταμα αβαλ ητε πιωτ, 20:25-27). The importance of this passage is evident both by reason of its own detail and the writer's doxology that follows it (20:27-28).

Exegesis of the passage

(1) αἰστοανρ αβαλ, "He became manifest." The original Greek of the term was probably ἐφανερώθη. Thus the clause reflects Johannine (e.g. 1 John 1:2; 3:5, 8; 4:9) and Pauline (e.g. 2 Cor. 4:10, 11; Col. 3:4; 1 Tim. 3:16; Tit. 1:3) ideas. In all of these references, the Bohairic and Sahidic versions translate the Greek verb φανεροῦν by οὔωνῃ εἶδολ.¹ The same Coptic verb is used in Hebr. 9:26 and 1 Pet. 1:20 where φανεροῦν occurs in connection with the cross.

(2) αἰσαλερ πατωμε ετμε, "He clothed himself with that book," or "He donned that book." This is what the text reads.² The writer evidently combines here his unique ideas of the "incarnation" and death of Jesus. Jesus, he says, does not identify himself with all humanity but only with his "book."³ These chosen ones are his body and thus, they go to the cross with him. The significance of the crucifixion lies in the fact that when it occurs the fellowship becomes a definite entity, for "He clothed himself with that book."

(3) αἰαγτε αἰγε, "He was nailed to wood" (cf. 18:24 and the discussion on p. 124).

(4) αἰτωσε παταταμα αβαλ ητε πιωτ, "He publicly proclaimed the Father's testamentary will (on the cross)" (20:25-27), i.e. by nailing it to the cross. As Grobel observes, Col. 2:14 has

¹ Cf. G. Horner, *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905), and *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911).

² Among the translators, Schenke alone (*op. cit.*, p. 37) renders the text as it is, i.e. *Er bekleidete sich mit jenem Buche*. Grobel, *op. cit.*, p. 66, note 114, emends the text to read αἰσαλπερ, "He opened (that book)." The *notes critiques* of the *Ev. Ver.* text, p. 53, suggest that the Coptic translator misunderstood the sense of the Greek verb ἀναλαμβάνειν, which can mean "to clothe" but also, "to take up, take to one's self." Till, *Orientalia*, N.S., 27 (1958), 274, appears to defend the Coptic text but in his translation, *ZNTW*, 50 (1959), 171, renders simply *nahm das Buch an sich*.

³ Justin, to the contrary, holds that the incarnation of Jesus was in behalf of the entire human race (I. 63:10), and that every race of men partakes (μετέσχε) of Christ (I. 46:2).

undoubtedly inspired the *Ev. Ver.* text.¹ In both passages something is nailed to the cross; in the Colossian text, "the bond . . . with its legal demands" (RSV), in *Ev. Ver.*, "the testamentary will of the Father."² The contrast of the two texts, however, is very marked. In Colossians, the "handwriting" is *against* man. It is a bond of obligation incurred through violation of the Divine will, which, by nailing it to his cross, Christ has removed from man once and for all.³ In *Ev. Ver.*, the ΔΙΑΤΑΥΛΙΑ belongs to the Father and it is *in behalf* of man. Far from being a bond of obligation, it is a bond of affiliation, binding the believers to Jesus.

The progression of thought through the passage and its context (19:34-20:27)

(1) The appearance of the living book in the hearts of believers, during the ministry of Jesus, was an indication of God's purpose (19:34-20:1). This purpose was eternal since the book "stands written" (qual. ΕΤΗΧΘ in 19:36) in the mind and thought of the Father (19:36-20:1).

(2) Jesus takes the book and thereby the Divine purpose becomes manifest in a decisive way, especially its elective aspect. Jesus takes "the living book" not the world.

(3) The living book is the deed (ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ) of inheritance (20:14-20). The contents of the deed are unknown until the householder dies. Just so, the contents of the living book are known only upon the death of Jesus. The "contents" are basically the Father's hiddenness, the identity of the elect, and their relationship to the Father through gnosis. The way of gnosis comes from the Father alone.

(4) Jesus wore the book as he was nailed to the cross.⁴ The description reinforces the remark made previously. The writer of *Ev. Ver.* is not concerned with the historicity of the cross but with its meaning. The body nailed to the cross, he says, was the body of believers, the living book of the living ones. Divine revelation is anthropocentric. It does not connote the acts of God in the world in behalf of men, but the manifestation of the living fellow-

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 67, note 116.

² While the text of *Ev. Ver.* does not say that the ΔΙΑΤΑΥΛΙΑ was nailed to the cross, it is indicated from the context.

³ Such is the force of the perfect tense ἔρκεν in Col. 2:14.

⁴ A suggestion of 1 Pet. 2:24.

ship of Gnostics and the intimate relationship they enjoy with Jesus. In an essential, metaphysical, sense, the fellowship is fully identified with Jesus in his death.

(5) The living book is the ΔΙΑΤΑΓΜΑ of the Father. The borrowed Greek word διάταγμα has two main ideas, "edict" and "testamentary will." The sense of "edict" occurs once in the New Testament (Hebr. 11:23), once in the Ignatian letters,¹ twice in the fragments of the Apology of Melito,² and a number of times in the papyri.³ The second meaning of διάταγμα, i.e. "testamentary will" is not found in the New Testament nor in any extant early Christian writings, but it does occur in the papyri. Two examples may be cited to show this meaning. The first,⁴ dated in A.D. 119, refers to the status of the "testamentary will" in the case of army draftees during the period of their military service. The second,⁵ dated A.D. 83, refers to the "testamentary will" which a widow has received from her deceased husband. In the *Ev. Ver.* text (20:26), the meaning of ΔΙΑΤΑΓΜΑ is probably "testamentary will" though Schenke⁶ and Isenberg⁷ decide for "edict." The writer evidently means that on the cross, Jesus publicly placards (ἀφῴωσε... ἀβδλ) the testamentary will of the Father.⁸ The contents of the will are the Gnostics themselves. That is, the Father wills over to the Son the chosen ones who, through the manifestation of the Son in his death, acquire gnosis of the Father, of themselves, and of the meaning of their relationship to the Father through Jesus.⁹

¹ ITr. 7:1 τὰ διατάγματα τ. ἀποστόλων. J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, part II, vol. II, sect. 1, p. 169, renders the word as "ordinances," and comments, "The reference is doubtless to the institution of episcopacy" (*ibid.*).

² Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, IV. 26:5-6 (= an "edict" against Christians).

³ Cf. Moulton and Milligan, *op. cit.*, p. 155a. Cf. also the close linguistic parallel to *Ev. Ver.* listed by E. Kiessling, *Sammelbuch griechischen Urkunden aus Aegypten* (Wiesbaden: Selbstverlag in Kommission bei O. Harrassowitz, 1955), V, 66, no. 7622, lines 9-10, τὰ ἀντίγραφα τούτου μου τοῦ διατάγματος δημοσίᾳ προὔταξα "I posted publicly the copies of this edict of mine."

⁴ Cf. the text in *Aegyptische Urkunden aus den koeniglichen Museen zu Berlin, griechische Urkunden* (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1895), I, 156, lines 20-28.

⁵ Cf. the text in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, X (Oxford: University Press, 1914), 226, no. 1282, line 27.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 37.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 149.

⁸ The translations in the published text of *Ev. Ver. Verfügung, disposition*, and "testamentary disposition," all show this basic meaning.

⁹ Cf. the expression in John 17:6, οὗς ἔδωκάς μοι ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου (cf. also vss. 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, and John 18:9).

e. A fifth section on the death *and* "resurrection" of Jesus and of the participation of the gnostic fellowship therein, occurs in 20:28-21:2. A spontaneous doxology (20:27-28) breaks into the middle of the writer's treatment of the cross and "resurrection," immediately following which the writer resumes his theme of the death of Jesus (20:28-29).

Exegesis of the passage

(1) The death is voluntary on Jesus' part (cf. John 10:17 f.), for, "He draws himself downward to death" (20:28-29). The curious thing is that, according to the writer, as Jesus dies he is clothed with eternal life (20:29-30).¹ The writer is acquainted with Phil. 2:5 ff. Jesus is ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ, and thus is clothed with eternal life. But he assumed μορφῇ δούλου and thus "experienced" death. Yet he never ceases to possess Divine life.

(2) The one reference in *Ev. Ver.* to Jesus' "resurrection" occurs in 20:30-34. Jesus strips himself of the rags of corruption and puts on incorruptibility. By "rags of corruption," the writer undoubtedly means the earthly, material flesh of Jesus.² It is this earthly life in the flesh which conceals his true identity. With his death, however, his true nature comes to light. The significance of his life in the flesh lies in the fact that it temporarily concealed his true *morphe*, i.e. his Divine nature. As in Plato, the εἶδος or ἰδέα is the true, heavenly, eternal reality,³ so in *Ev. Ver.* the true reality is the heavenly flesh and blood of Jesus. In saying that Jesus divests himself of corruption and dons incorruption, the writer may show the influence of Col. 3:9-10.⁴ If so, he has completely transformed the passage. The incorruptibility which Jesus assumes is his "resurrection" flesh, "which no one has the power to take from him" (20:33-34),⁵ and "whose progress no one hindered⁶ because it is incorruptibility" (31:5-8).

¹ The A₂ qual. form **το** "clothed" gives the sense of state or condition much like the Greek perfect tense.

² Cf. K. Grobel, *op. cit.*, p. 69, note 123.

³ Cf. Norman Gulley, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-31, 64-67, 120 ff.; David Ross, *Plato's Theory of Ideas* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), pp. 11-21; the *Phaedo*, *Phaedrus*, and the *Republic* (especially the "cave parable" in 514 A ff.) among Plato's works.

⁴ ἀπεκδυσάμενοι τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον . . . καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον τὸν ἀνακατανούμενον.

⁵ Cf. John 10:17-18.

⁶ Cf. John 20:19, 26.

(3) The lot of the believers lies in his death and "resurrection" (20:34-21:2). Jesus comes to the Gnostics in the midst of their existence in Forgetting, i.e. in the world with all of its change and lack of meaning.¹ These chosen ones are described as being naked (20:37)² due to Forgetting. The metaphor of nakedness means the desperate plight of men apart from the gnosis of the Father. The gospel of Thomas presents a different idea. It makes nakedness to mean physical death at which time the body of flesh is discarded for a heavenly body.³ B. Gärtner comments, "According to a common Gnostic idea the soul of man is naked after death, and must tread the difficult path up to the heavenly world in constant exposure to the attacks of the evil powers. Only those who possess knowledge of the watchword are able to reach the goal."⁴ Contrariwise, *Ev. Ver.* presents the potential chosen ones as "naked" in this life due to Forgetting. The text implies that as Jesus comes to them through his death and resurrection, they are clothed—presumably with the clothing of incorruptibility such as Jesus wears. At any rate, Jesus is said to become to them their gnosis (20:38), their completeness (20:39), and their teacher, instructing them in the basic meaning of his death and resurrection (20:39-21:2).

Summary and Comparison

Justin views the cross and resurrection of Jesus as the focal point of God's redemptive plan seen in the history of his chosen people Israel. The apodictic feature is especially strong. Justin is intent on proving—in detail—the truth of the ancient prophecies. Nevertheless, he does not lose sight of the redemptive significance of the cross. Christ did effect redemption when he died and arose. To be sure, there is a strong moralistic emphasis in Justin's writings. Moreover, salvation is frequently linked by him to the future. Yet, at the same time, Justin can say and does say that men experience here and now the redemption which Christ purchased. To deny this fact would mean to deny the writer's avowed belief

¹ Till, *ZNTW*, 50 (1959), 172, thinks that the empty spaces of terror mean the material world.

² The verb **ετῶν** is qual. (cf. the infin. form in 20:30).

³ Cf. Logion 21. The little children strip themselves and give the field back to its owners (i.e. by death they return the world to rulers).

⁴ *The Theology of the Gospel of Thomas* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961), p. 185.

in the effectiveness of renewal (I. 61:1) or regeneration (I. 61:3-4) through Christ, or his faith in the reality of the Christian fellowship including the sacraments.

The death of Jesus is likewise important for the writer of *Ev. Ver.*; the "resurrection" is only briefly intimated. The writer's primary concern is with the meaning—not the event. He insists that the fruit of the cross is joy in the gnosis of the Father (= the share of the Gnostics in God himself). It is at the cross that the testamentary will (= the Gnostics) of God becomes manifest in Jesus. The Gnostics are the body of Jesus which Jesus dons and carries to the cross with him. The "resurrection" of Jesus means that he puts on incorruptibility with which he also clothes the Gnostics. The pivotal clause in *Ev. Ver.*, "He clothed himself with that book" (20:24-25) may be compared to Justin's Apology I. 32:8. In discussing the Messianic passage in Gen. 49:11 (πλύνων τὴν στολὴν αὐτοῦ ἐν αἵματι σταφυλῆς),¹ Justin observes that the men who believe in Christ, i.e. those in whom the seed from God (= the Logos) dwells, are the ones who constitute the garment of Christ. In D. 54:1, referring to the same text, Justin says, "The Holy Spirit calls his garment those who have received forgiveness of sins through him, among whom he is always present in power." Justin, as well as the writer of *Ev. Ver.*, is referring to the passion of Jesus. But a sharp difference from *Ev. Ver.* needs to be noticed. Justin's approach to Christ's passion is typological; the approach of the writer of *Ev. Ver.* is metaphysical. For Justin, the incarnation and passion of Jesus are unique events, each of which stands by itself. According to the writer of *Ev. Ver.* (cf. 20:24-25), however, the incarnation and passion of Jesus tend to blend and coalesce making it difficult to distinguish between them in any clear way.

PROPOSITION IV

The writings of Justin and *Ev. Ver.* stress the circumstance that man must appropriate truth in order for truth to have meaning. In this respect, the comparisons and contrasts between the two writers may be seen in four areas—man's innate capacity, the problem of evil, Divine power, and the means of appropriation.

A. *Man's innate capacity*

1. According to Justin. Justin affirms that man's body is made

¹ In I. 32:8, Justin quotes the LXX loosely, in D. 52-2 and 54:1 exactly.

by God from the ground. He says that the plural verb ποιήσωμεν "Let us make . . ." (Gen. 1:26), does not mean that God addressed angels or earthly elements but that he addressed a being distinct from him in number and possessed of the Logos (D. 62:2-4). Justin does not present a full trinitarian interpretation of the passage but he has taken a definite step in that direction.¹ Along with his body, man is said to have a ψυχή. Justin does not explain the origin of the soul precisely though he does say that it is created wholly apart from its respective body (D. 5:4).² Goodenough thinks that Justin's belief constitutes a rejection of the Aristotelian view which makes the soul σώματός τι, i.e. an attribute of the body.³ In I. 18, the Apologist appeals to Greek mythology, to popular belief, as well as to philosophers, in order to strengthen his argument in favor of the idea of consciousness after death. The souls of men, he says, are ἐν αἰσθήσει, i.e. they have the power of sensation. Contrariwise, D. 6:2 suggests that life may be withdrawn from the soul and that the soul may return to its place of origin. Justin's meaning lacks clarity. Is the "withdrawal" only a hypothetical possibility? From whence did the soul come? Justin does affirm that the soul is the seat of personality, and desire (D. 2:4), and of hope (D. 44:4). It may be perceptive and sound (I. 21:5), or full of ignorance (I. 12:11) and deceit (D. 14:2), yet it can be kindled with love for the prophets and friends of Christ (D. 8:1), and, through the suffering of Christ (D. 41:1), it can be made pure (D. 14:2).

In addition to man's body and soul, God, says Justin, has put within each man a Divine particle, the seed of the Logos (= a higher νοῦς) which imparts to man both life and power. Neither as a principle of Divine life nor as a higher mind is the Logos native to the ψυχή. The Logos is not the seat of man's personality.⁴ Man, however, shares in the Logos. His soul lives because it partakes (μεταλαμβάνειν) or shares (μετέχειν) in life. Everything depends on God's will to give life to the ψυχή. Thus man's soul may rise to comprehend Divine things because it shares actively in the power

¹ Cf. R. McL. Wilson, "The Early History of the Exegesis of Gen. 1:26," *Texte und Untersuchungen*, 63 (1957), 437.

² This assumes that the viewpoint of the old man becomes the viewpoint of Justin himself. Cf. A. Puech, *Les Apologistes Grecs* (Paris: Librairie Hachette et Cie, 1912), pp. 126-127.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 214.

⁴ Cf. Goodenough, *ibid.*, p. 218.

of the Logos. According to Goodenough, Justin implies that the presence of the Logos-seed in man is equivalent to the presence of the Logos himself. Goodenough remarks, "The higher mind of man is thus itself the Spermatic Logos of God. The inferiority of the human mind to the Logos is the inferiority of a part to the whole, not of derivative to its source."¹ The "spermatic Logos" of Justin's writings has been the subject of numerous treatments.² Goodenough contends that the idea is to be linked to the Stoics via the δύναναι ἀληθινῆς ζωῆς of Philo.³ More correctly, however, A. L. Feder insists that the Apologist found the framework for the pre-existent Logos-teaching, not in Greek or Alexandrian-Jewish background, but in the Holy Scriptures. The Scriptures provided the springboard for the development of the doctrine in Justin's writings.⁴ Moreover, A. Puech⁵ and J. Lebreton⁶ emphasize the basic difference in meaning that terms such as the spermatic Logos have in Justin's writings as over against Philo and/or the Stoic school. Lebreton asserts that in Justin, the terms constitute more the external polish beneath which one finds Justin's faith.⁷ Several other exceptions may be taken to Goodenough's general treatment of the subject. First, by tracing various parts of Justin's anthropology

¹ *Ibid.*

² Representative treatments of the last 100 years are; J. Donaldson, *op. cit.*, II (1866), 218-226; M. von Engelhardt, *Das Christentum Justins des Märtyrers* (Erlangen: A. Deichert, 1878), pp. 107-126; G. T. Purves, *op. cit.* (1890), pp. 148-156; J. Rivière, *S. Justin et les Apologues du deuxième siècle* (1907), pp. 196-207; A. Puech, *Apologues grecs du 2^e siècle de notre ère* (Paris: Librairie Hachette et Cie, 1912), pp. 67, 126-131; E. R. Goodenough, *The Theology of Justin Martyr* (1923), pp. 139-175; J. Lebreton, *Histoire du Dogme de La Trinité* (Paris: G. Beauchesne, éditeur, 1927-28), II, 430-439; H. A. Wolfson, *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers*, I (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), 257-287.

³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 221-224. More recently, B. Altaner, *Patrology* (Freiburg: Herder, 1960), p. 125, has adopted the same view. Goodenough's emphasis is very curious. On the one hand (*op. cit.*, p. 141), he equates the second God of the Dialogue with the pre-existent and incarnate Logos of the Apologies. On the other hand, he connects the spermatic Logos—active among the ancient sages—with a Philonic and/or Stoic base. But in view of passages such as I. 63:10 and D. 56, the primary significance of the spermatic Logos who was in every man, is that he functions in every man who is open to his power. Cf. O. A. Piper, *JR*, 41 (1961), 167, note 52. Justin surely did not offer one source for the pre-incarnate Logos in I. 63:10; D. 56, and a different source for the term, "spermatic Logos."

⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. 153 f.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. 315-318, with an appendix on the λόγος σπερματικός.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, II, 436-439.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 439, note 1.

to Philo, serious differences from Philo must be duly recognized. Justin held that God created man's body while Philo attributed its composition to lower powers.¹ Justin held to a personal Logos, Philo to an impersonal Logos. Moreover, one finds that the teaching of bodily resurrection in Justin's writings contrasts with Philo's idea. Second, Goodenough gives undue emphasis to the idea of the βασιλικὸς νοῦς.² The term occurs only once in all of Justin's writings (D. 4:2). It appears in a question of the old man, i.e. "Is the soul a part of that royal mind itself?" In view of the context where, by means of the Socratic method, the stranger brings about a marked change in Justin's philosophical views, one can legitimately question whether the term βασιλικὸς νοῦς eventually influenced the new outlook of the reborn Justin. Furthermore, in describing this "regal mind" Goodenough's words do not agree precisely with the text. He claims Justin as asserting that a part of the βασιλικὸς νοῦς is in us³. The text of D. 4:2, however, presents not an assertion but a question, i.e. "Is the soul . . . a part of that regal mind itself?" Third, Goodenough thinks that Justin names the higher, divine principle in man either Logos or *pneuma*.⁴ As support for the term *pneuma*, he appeals to the phrase τὸ ζωτικὸν πνεῦμα in D. 6:2. But, in view of the fact that Justin uses the term *pneuma* nowhere else in this way, and, since in this context, *pneuma* is equated simply with ζωή, the Divine attribute, it is best to avoid equating *pneuma* with logos.⁵ The point is not unimportant. Since the Stoics used λόγος σπερματικὸς and πνεῦμα indiscriminately to describe the active element in universal matter,⁶ Justin's consistent avoidance of *pneuma* as a synonym for Logos is one indication of the difference between his theology and that of the Stoics. Thus, according to Justin, man is composed of body and soul, to which God has added the λόγος or higher νοῦς. "Men were made λογικοί [sic!] καὶ θεωρητικοί, and there is in the soul of every man the

¹ *The Loeb Classical Library, Philo*, I, 166, 168, on Gen. 2:7. Goodenough (*op. cit.*, p. 221) recognizes the phenomenon but thinks that the agreement of the two writers outweighs their differences.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 62, 65 f., 70, 215, 218.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 218.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 214.

⁵ Cf. Archambault, *op. cit.*, I, 34 f., note 2, though the writer confuses the issue by stating that the meaning of *pneuma* in D. 6:2 is the breath of God, an idea "very close to . . . the Stoics" (*ibid.*).

⁶ Cf. Goodenough, *op. cit.*, p. 161.

ability to ally himself with this part."¹ The indication is that man is capable of appropriating God's truth. Man has freewill within, says Justin, and yet he faces metaphysical evil, both within and without.

2. According to *Ev. Ver.* The word **πωμε** "man" occurs in *Ev. Ver.* in 27:14 and 30:13 only. In addition, however, the word is found in the compound forms **ρᾱῆρητ**, "wise men" (19:26) and **ᾱῆτρᾱῆρητ**, "wisdom" (31:17; 33:8-9). The writer's frequent reference to man, however, is expressed by the various pronouns of the third person, singular and plural, as well as by the verbal auxiliaries of the third person singular masculine and of the third person common plural. Occasionally the first person plural (cf. 25:19-22) and second person plural (cf. 32:38-39 and the general emphasis of plate 33, e.g. 33:8, 13, 17) appear. The latter fact supports the view that *Ev. Ver.* is a homily. The preacher (= the writer) addresses directly the congregation of believers. Thus, for an understanding of man in *Ev. Ver.*, one must consider the variety of ways man is alluded to in pronouns and verbal auxiliaries. In contrast to Justin's writings where one can examine the various constituent parts of the nature of an individual man, one understands in *Ev. Ver.* that men are divided into different representative types.

a. First, there are the *hulic* men (31:4). They are strangers to Christ, unable to see him or to know him, due to the incomprehensible character of the flesh in which he came (31:4-9).² Quite clearly the writer attributes to the *hulikoi* a **πλᾱσμα** or "molded form." They also possess psychical qualities (cf. **ψυχικον** in 34:19). Thus they are called **σοφος** (19:21) though the wisdom which they possess is purely their own, not God's (19:21-23).

¹ Goodenough, *op. cit.*, p. 219.

² The borrowed Greek word *ὑλη* is feminine, and thus, the Coptic text prefixes the feminine article, i.e. **ϥϣλḥ** (= **τρϣλḥ**). The *notes critiques* of the *Ev. Ver.* text (p. 57) suggest the emended reading **ḥᾱϥϣλḥ**, "those belonging to *hule*" (= οἱ ὑλικοί) which is parallel to the phrase **ḥᾱτᾱḥτε**, "those belonging to the middle" (17:34-35). But the change of text in 31:4 is unnecessary. Each of the three verbs of 31:1-4a has the third plural auxiliary which makes the meaning clear without emendation. The forms of the three verbs reveal the hopeless nature of these men. The two imperfects (**ḥετοει**, 31:1, **ḥετηετ** . . . **ει**, 31:2) show the continual dilemma which they face, while the negative perfect (**ḥεᾱποτσοτωνḥ**, 31:3-4) accents decisively the underlying reason for their dilemma.

Moreover, they are said to tempt Christ and to hate him (19:23, 25-27). They are to be described, however, more by what they are not and what they lack than by what they are and have. They are "empty" (19:25-26), deficient (21:15) in gnosis of Christ (31:3-4) and the Father (16:39-17:1). As they remain in this condition to the end, they maintain only the shell of a molded form possessed by Forgetting (21:35-36). The writer describes them as "contemptible ones" (κτενω, 21:38) though he does not make clear whether or not they sense their wretched state. They are utterly void of existence (28:22-23) and, accordingly, they have no name (39:11-14). Their ultimate destiny is in Hades (42:17-18).

b. Second, there are the Gnostics (οἱ γνωστικοί), or, those who have come to know (cf. ἀρεσασθε in 19:32). The object of their gnosis is the Father (18:7), the Son (30:24-25; 37:38), and themselves (21:6-7, 22:13-15; 23:10; 25:11-12). They are "forth-ones" (ϣηδαβαλ) from the one who exists (28:12-13; cf. 22:3-4; 33:32; 34:1-2). This description of the writer tells of the origin and nature of the Gnostics.¹ A basic Valentinian tenet is that the human spirit belongs to the spiritual world.² *Ev. Ver.* reveals the same principle. That the Gnostics live in a material body is implicitly recognized in 25:15-17, but the text emphasizes that their share in a *hulic* world is a passing phase of their existence. The subject of the verb εφοσωα "it consumes" (25:15) is probably σασθε, "gnosis" (25:13). Thus, the passage shows that the material shell of the *gnostikoi* is to be consumed or banished, lit. "devoured," by gnosis itself. Quispel points out that, according to Valentinus, there are three parts to the soul, τὸ ὕλικόν, or what Plato calls τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν, "the passionate (part)," τὸ ψυχικόν = "the moral principle and consciousness," and τὸ πνευματικόν = "the spiritual seed" deposited in man, a fact unknown to the demiurge.³ Conceivably, this division of the soul may be present in *Ev. Ver.* by implication, but it does not appear in any definite form. There is, however, a definite stress on a spiritual quality which characterizes

¹ A comparison of the Sahidic version of 1 Cor. 2:12 ἀλλὰ πενήτα πεβολ ἄπκοτε and of John 8:32 ἡτετῇ ϣηβολ ϣῃπεικοςμος shows the direction of emphasis in the idiom of *Ev. Ver.*

² Cf. G. Quispel, "La Conception de l'homme dans la Gnose valentinienne," *Eranos-Jahrbuch*, XV (1947), 262.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 267.

the Gnostics. They are those who know (19:32) and in their gnosis, they receive joy (18:28-29) while they anticipate rest (22:11-12; 42:31-32) and fullness or completeness in the Father (18:36-19:4).

c. Third, there are the potential Gnostics. All Gnostics were in this category before the manifestation of Jesus Christ (20:6-9). The writer insists that gnosis is the fruit of the cross (18:24-26), and that Jesus becomes gnosis (20:38-39) because of his death (cf. the preceding context, especially 20:23-27). The writer lays stress on this potential element by using a tense of unfulfilled action. Several examples of the construction follow:

(1) In 27:15-21, the tense of unfulfilled action occurs twice with the same verb, $\text{HE}\overline{\text{A}}\text{ΠATOT}\overline{\text{X}}\text{I}^1$ (27:16-17) and $\overline{\text{A}}\text{ΠATOT}\overline{\text{X}}\text{I}$ (27:17-18). After Schenke² who seems to have sensed the flow of the language, the passage is to be rendered, "They were knowing this that they had not yet received form, nor yet had they received name which (things) the Father normally begets in each one at the time when they receive form from that gnosis of his." The auxiliary $\overline{\text{A}}\text{ΠAT}(\text{OT})$ describes action which has not yet been accomplished but which will in due course come to fruition.³

(2) In 27:29-36, the same auxiliary occurs twice with the verb $\omega\omega\text{ΠE}$ "to become" (27:31-32 and 35-36) indicating again the pre- and post-gnostic states. The determining factor in the change is the Father's will (28:1-3).

(3) In 28:3-6, the auxiliary occurs in connection with the brief parable on the KAIPOC or "opportune moment." The potential gnostic condition is like an impending KAIPOC .

(4) In 30:19-23, the text pictures the potential gnostic as "prostrate on the ground," either in sleep or drunkenness—i.e. in forgetfulness of his true nature. The decisive awakening moment comes as the Spirit stretches forth his hand to him. To this, the writer adds, "He [the Gnostic] had not yet [i.e. before this time] risen up" (30:22-23).

Summary and Comparison

Justin views man as a begotten being—both body and soul. His belief that man's body is God's creation and that his flesh is

¹ The prefix HE gives the sense of the past perfect.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 43.

³ Cf. Plumley, *op. cit.*, pp. 103 f., § 224, and Steindorff, *op. cit.*, pp. 169 f., §§ 362-363.

to share in resurrection shows his Biblical orientation. His belief that man, in addition to his begotten soul, partakes of a higher *nous* or *logos*, shows his Platonic background, but with an important difference. To share in the *Logos* means for Justin to be receptive to the presence and power of *the Logos*, i.e. Christ. Man's ability to appropriate truth springs from his choice to allow the power of the *Logos* to motivate him within.

According to *Ev. Ver.*, there is no common basic nature to mankind as a whole. Men are rather classified as *hulic*, gnostic, or potentially gnostic, all of which means that there is no innate ability to appropriate truth. For *hulic* men, truth is unattainable. Their position is hopeless. The gnostic men—actual and potential—appear in sharp contrast. They have (the potential Gnostics “will have”) what the *hulic* men do not have for they are “forth-ones from on high,” i.e. they have a high origin and nature. Thus their share in the *hulic* or material existence is only a passing phase of their true existence which lies in the Father. The essential contrast to the anthropology of Justin is apparent. First, Justin senses that man was created at a definite time, that his soul was begotten and thus is not eternal. The writer of *Ev. Ver.* lays stress on the lofty origin and nature of the Gnostics. They are in the Father and come forth from him (17:5-6). Second, Justin speaks of a common nature which all men share. Hence all men can appropriate truth. The writer of *Ev. Ver.* denies this. Only the Gnostics can come to appreciate and appropriate the gospel of Truth.

B. *The problem of evil*

1. According to Justin. Justin believes in the capacity of the human will. The tragedy of evil takes on a new dimension in that man possesses the decisive faculty of choice. Created by God, man can know the truth and decide for it or against it. This is why, says Justin, that the human race is “without excuse” (ἀναπολόγητος, I. 28:3, cf. Rom. 1:20; 2:1) before God. The Apologist finds that εἰμαρμένη, “fate,” is diametrically opposed to the faculty of choice (I. 43:1-3, 6, 7; 44:11; II. 7:3, 4, 9). *Apol.* I. 28, II. 7, and I. 43, all contain strong expressions in this respect. The two perfect verbs in I. 28:3 (πεποίηκεν and γεγέννηται) highlight God's providential foresight in making the human race responsible to choose and perform the things that are true. Man's choice and

action constitute the very nature of existence and thus remain firm in successive generations. The false Stoic teaching of *εἰμαρμένη*, says the writer, receives its deathblow through the *προαίρεσις ἐλευθέρα*, "free choice" (I. 43:3; II. 7:8-9).¹ Eliminate freedom of choice, says Justin, and you relieve man of responsibility for his actions—whatever their essential nature (I. 43:6). Eliminate freedom of choice and man ceases to differ from trees and quadrupeds (I. 43:8). Eliminate freedom of choice and vice and virtue lose their meaning for life and fall prey to fate which thus is made the cause of evil and to act against itself (I. 43:6). To cap his argument at this point, the writer insists that to say that vice and virtue exist only as opinions without having basic reality in life, is to commit the greatest act of impiety and injustice (I. 43:6). Thus, one not only chooses to be born anew (I. 61:10) but also to live as a Christian in this world. The organ or means of effecting a right choice is the Logos. It is the Logos which directs the pious ones to honor that which alone is true (I. 2:1). It teaches man (I. 2:1) enabling him, by means of the faculties God has given him, to make the right choice (I. 10:4). Thus, Justin can appeal to Xenophon's report of Hercules' standing at a "Y" intersection facing two women—Virtue and Vice (II.11). Since Hercules will not continue on his own course, he must choose between the two arms of the "Y". Such, according to Justin, is the situation of all men—Christian, Jew, and pagan, alike.

If, however, in the first place, Justin insists on the basic element of the human choice in Christian living, he emphasizes no less, as a second element, the metaphysical character of evil. "*We* deserted" (*ἀπέστημεν*), but "*we* deserted *those* (demons)," is his statement in I. 14:1. That is, the man who makes the right choice sets himself in a state of continuous opposition to demons just as the one who chooses wrongly places himself under demonic control. So man faces freedom of choice but there is also the adversary. It is the demons, says the writer, who have caused the persecution of Christians and who have sown the seeds of destruction and ignorance. Obviously, these demons find a ready ally (*σύμμαχος*)

¹ There is a definite probability of influence on Justin in this respect by Carneades (ca. 214 B.C.—129 B.C.), founder of the New Academy. Cf. the careful examination of evidence in "*Fatalisme et Liberté*" dans *L'Antiquité grecque* (Louvain: Bibliothèque de L'université, 1945), pp. 195-207, by Dom David Amand.

in each person, namely, in each man's natural bent to evil (I. 10:6).¹ But it is the demons themselves who constitute the chief agency of evil. It should be observed that the Apologist uses *πράσσειν* and its congeners (also *ἔργον*) almost as frequently of the demons as of the Christians (cf., e.g. I. 21:5, 6; 5:4; II. 5:5; 12:3). According to I. 56, Justin finds that demons carried on a work before Christ came and that they have continued to work by setting forth men such as Simon Magus and Menander, in a concerted endeavor to nullify the work of Christ.

2. According to *Ev. Ver.* Like the writings of Justin *Ev. Ver.* indicates that man is able to appropriate Divine truth. In contrast to Justin, however, it was observed above that the writer of *Ev. Ver.* attributes this capacity to the elect of God, alone. Only God's chosen ones can respond to his call and appropriate the truth which God has to give. Evidence for the fact lies before the reader on almost every page of *Ev. Ver.* According to 16:32-34, those who appropriate the gospel of Truth (or, the Word, or, the Father²) have received grace to do so. The gospel is manifested to the complete ones (18:13-14) who constitute the living book of the living ones, written beforehand (21:23) on the Father's *nous* (19:34-20:1; 21:3-5). The Divine call inevitably calls forth a positive response (22:4-5). As the truth of the gospel comes into the middle (26:27-28), it is embraced—not by all but by those only who are the offspring (? *†* *ἡ*³, 26:29) of Truth. The destiny of men hinges entirely on God's will to give form and name to the ones whom he desires to make manifest (27:26-29). These references are sufficient to show the stress in *Ev. Ver.* on the ability of the elect alone to appropriate Divine truth. This is in accord with the general Valentinian view of Divine determinism. While Valentinus admitted that the soul or spirit comes to repentance, he would not admit that the change springs from a free decision. He rejected freewill and taught that the spirits of believers are

¹ Goodenough, *op. cit.*, pp. 228 f., thinks that this text shows that the Apologist viewed the *ἐπιθυμία* as part of the created soul. Goodenough fails, however, to consider seriously the adjective *κακή*. The "desire" is an evil desire.

² The third masc. sing. suffix in the form *ἀπορροσωνῆ* (16:33) can conceivably and reasonably refer to any one of these three antecedents.

³ S. Arai, *op. cit.*, p. 46 f., inclines toward the translation "Gestalt" ("form") or "Abbild" ("copy").

saved because there is an essential disposition within them to be saved (ἐκ φύσεως σώζεσθαι).¹

Over against the Divine determinism, however, men—whether *gnostikoi* or *hulikoi*—face opposition. In Justin's writings, opposition is mainly personal, in the form of Satan and the evil demons. In *Ev. Ver.*, opposition or evil is impersonal, usually called **πλάνη** (Gr. *πλάνη*), "Error."² In 17:9 ff., Error is referred to no fewer than three times. The passage shows evil in the cosmos to be a natural process. Ignorance of the Father produces fright which in turn produces a mist or fog in which Error works in "a molded form" to produce beauty, the counterfeit (**τὰ ἄδω**, 17:20) of Truth, and to lead away captive those who belong to the middle. The passage is puzzling. The very process as presented makes it difficult for one to sense what is the origin of evil, according to *Ev. Ver.* Apparently the writer means that the cosmos is the molded form" in which Error functions, and thus, the exhortation to "disdain Error" (17:28) is vital since Error poses a very real threat to the Gnostics. Such a conclusion is supported by 22:20-21 where Jesus is said to have turned many away from Error. The cosmos as "the middle" is the world of Error. *Ev. Ver.* agrees, in one sense, with Plato for Plato also believed that the world was full of error. On the other hand, Plato thought that truth was never realized in the cosmos. The world contains pointers to the truth but the truth itself belongs to the eternal ideas. To him, the cosmos functions primarily as the place where philosophers can see the truth. The writer of *Ev. Ver.*, however, believed that though truth is not native to the world, it is present in the world as a heavenly stranger: Since Error is also present, the battle-lines are drawn. Both Truth and Error attempt to attract or draw (cf. **ὥρ** in 32:12 and 17:34) men to their respective sides. The fact that men seek the gospel of Truth (17:3-4) and that they grow weary in their search (24:16-18), that they wait expectantly for the good news (34:36-35:6), that they—as chosen ones—are bidden to disdain Error (17:28-29), that they stand naked before God in Forgetfulness of him and of their true nature (20:37-38),

¹ Cf. G. Quispel, "La Conception de l'homme dans la Gnose valentinienne," *Erano-Jahrbuch*, XV (1947), 274.

² The word "sin" occurs twice (32:37; 35:26), the word "Devil" once (**δίαβολος** in 33:20). Error (**πλάνη**), however, occurs no fewer than eleven times (17:15, 29, 36; 18:22; 22:21, 24; 26:19, 26; 31:25; 32:37; 35:18).

that they are purified through the judgment manifested in the coming of Jesus (25:35-26:18), that they frankly confess how dark and unreal and meaningless their life is apart from the gnosis of the Father (28:26-33)—all of these things indicate that, in the world, the Father's chosen ones undergo a painful experience even though their origin and destiny in the Father are assured through a kind of cosmic fatalism.

Summary and Comparison

Justin affirms that the God-given freedom of choice which man enjoys enables him to choose the truth despite the presence of personal evil, i.e. the Devil and the demons. The right choice brings man into a conflict with the demons. Conversely, the wrong choice places him under their control.

Like Justin, the writer of *Ev. Ver.* affirms that man can appropriate Divine truth. This ability, however, according to *Ev. Ver.* is limited to the elect. They face impersonal opposition in the work of ΠΛΑΗΝ. The fact that the gnostic readers are warned to "disdain Error" (17:28-29) shows some idea of a basic threat to the Gnostics of involvement in Error. Goodenough observes how Justin describes the soul as a battlefield, the soul itself being also the "prize of victory between the two warring factions, the demons and the Logos in man."¹ The writer of *Ev. Ver.* also presents a battlefield but with different characteristics. It has been noticed already (see proposition I) that "the Middle" in *Ev. Ver.* is a metaphysical plane where the realities of Truth and Error meet, and that the meeting place occurs in the cosmos. The warring factions on this battlefield are Error and Truth (or the Father). Both attempt to draw men out of the middle to their respective sides.

C. Divine power

1. According to Justin. Does Justin believe that men are dependent upon Divine power to apprehend truth? In answer, the Apologist points to the innate *God-given* ability which enables man to choose what is true (I. 28:3). Justin views the gift as a Divine power (δύναμις) and not merely personal freedom of choice. The language of the Apologist is definite. Frequently, he uses the

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 219.

terms, δύνασθε μαθεῖν, "You are able to learn," νοεῖν δύνασθε, "You are able to discern," and πεισθῆναι δύνασθε, "You are able to be persuaded" (I. 28:1; 31:5; 34:2; 35:9; 37:9; 38:7; 39:2; 48:3; 53:1; 59:5; 63:9; 64:1; 66:4; D. 11:4; 40:1; 49:8; 69:4). Thus, whether Justin reflects upon pagan rulers or the unbelieving Jew, Trypho, he posits to each a Divinely-bestowed ability to comprehend Christian truth. As seen above, the impartation of the Logos means not only ζωή (D. 6:1-2), but δύναμις (I. 46:5). Through δύναμις man can respond positively in his encounter with truth (I. 46:5). A positive response, however, is dependent on several things. First, does one embrace truth, second, is he free from bigotry, and third, is he ruled by the Logos rather than by the κακὴ ἐπιθυμία (I. 10:6). Justin discovers that the power to respond differs between non-Christian and Christian. The non-Christian receives a seed (σπέρμα), bestowed (δοθέν) according to his capacity to receive it. The Christian, in addition to the seed, experiences the participation (μετουσία) and imitation (μίμησις) according to God's grace (II. 13:6). That is, the Christian understands the latent power of what God has given and enters into a realization of that power through Christ, the full Logos, whom he follows as his example. The Christian then is dependent on Divine power in two ways: subjectively, he knows God's truth because of the power of the Logos within; objectively, outside of himself, he comprehends and contemplates the complete Logos who has come in Jesus Christ (II. 8:3). It is the latter element that is distinctively Christian, according to Justin; the subjective element is that which the Christian holds in common with all men. Perhaps more than any text in Justin's writings, II. 10:8 accents the note of Divine power. After observing how Socrates used to urge men on (προὔτρεπετο, customary imperfect) to the knowledge of God (II. 10:6), the Apologist states that no one was won over to Socrates to the extent that he would die for his teaching. But, the Apologist adds, not only learned men but also craftsmen and those entirely void of learning have been won over to Christ so completely that they despise both glory and fear and death. The reason is that Christ is the power of the ineffable Father.¹

¹ Cf. also II. 8:3-4 where the name of Jesus Christ is said to prevail over the demons, D. 7:3 where Justin is exhorted to pray that the gates of light may be opened to him, and D. 8:1 where a fire was kindled in his soul effecting his conversion.

With due acknowledgment to the dynamic feature in Justin's writings, there still remains the question concerning the place Justin gives to the power of the Holy Spirit, especially his power in the life of the Christian. The Apologies and the Dialogue offer scores of references to the Holy Spirit. He is God's agent in creation (I. 59:3; 64:3). He is, Justin affirms persistently, the *προφητικὸν πνεῦμα*, that is, the Spirit who speaks prophetically through the prophets. Elsewhere the Holy Spirit is said to be the one who came upon the virgin Mary (D. 100:5), the one who rested upon Christ at his baptism (D. 87:5; 88:3-4), and the one whom Christians adore along with their adoration of Father and Son (I. 6:2; cf. 13:3; 60:7). In addition, one can say that Justin links the power and authority of the Holy Spirit to that of the Father and Son in the rite of Christian baptism (I. 61:3, 13) and in prayer (I. 65:3; 67:2). But the relationship of the Holy Spirit to the actual life of the Christian receives little attention in Justin's writings. According to D. 29:1, in a fervent fashion, the writer insists that he has no need of Jewish baptism since he is baptized by the Holy Spirit. The reference is brief and merely states that the Holy Spirit has accomplished some kind of permanent work in Justin. That the Holy Spirit bestows various *χαρίσματα* upon those who believe in Christ is alluded to in D. 87:6-88:1. The writer appeals to both Psalm 68:18 (67:19, LXX) and Joel 2:28 f. as prophecies which find their fulfillment among contemporaries of Justin who possess gifts of the Spirit of God. Nevertheless, the stress falls on specialized gifts of the Holy Spirit. Thus, neither from D. 29:1 nor D. 87:6-88:1 can one conclude that the Holy Spirit has a significant role to play in the daily life of Christians.

2. According to the writer of *Ev. Ver.* Considering the limited scope of *Ev. Ver.*, one finds that the Holy Spirit occupies a prominent place therein. The function of the Spirit in the Godhead as well as among men receives emphasis.

a. In the Godhead, the Spirit is said to be the Father's breast (24:10-11), his tongue (26:35-36), and his aroma (34:10-11). These expressions point to the relationship of the Holy Spirit to the Father. Beneath the breast is the heart while the tongue makes articulate the words that issue from the mouth. Likewise the Holy Spirit makes articulate and intelligible the Father's word of revelation. Moreover, what issues from the Father is as a sweet aroma.

b. Among men, the Spirit interprets to the Father's chosen ones, the self-manifestation of the Father in the Son. Whereas Justin is concerned with a statement of the formal position which the Holy Spirit occupies in the Godhead (I. 13:3; 60:6-7), *Ev. Ver.* is concerned with the essential function of the Spirit not only in the Godhead but also among the community of truth. The power of the Holy Spirit is received by every one who loves the truth (compare 26:33-34, 27:3-4 and 31:18-19).¹ The interpretative function of the Spirit appears in two passages. In 27:8-9, the Holy Spirit is probably the subject of the verb $\alpha\upsilon\delta\alpha\lambda\eta\tau\iota$ $\alpha\delta\alpha\lambda$, "He interpreted him," i.e. he interpreted the hidden one of the Father (= the Son). In 24:9-14, the interpretative function of the Holy Spirit is more definite. The expression, "hidden one of the Father," is also present in this text. There is probably some reflection of John 1:18 as the critical notes of the *Ev. Ver.* text suggest,² though John refers to the interpretative work of the Son ($\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$ $\epsilon\zeta\eta\gamma\gamma\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron$, John 1:18).

The most important text in *Ev. Ver.* on the Holy Spirit is found in 30:14-32. The background of the nightmare parable should be observed. The blind and prostrate man is he who has experienced the terrifying nightmare (28:32-30:14). The Holy Spirit, however, opens his eyes and raises him up.³ Essentially the writer presents the function of the Spirit within the community of truth. There are unquestionable New Testament features in the passage. The New Testament affirms that the Holy Spirit is the giver of life and the one who makes the work of the Son possible (cf. e.g. John 6:63; 16:13-15). Likewise in *Ev. Ver.*, it is the work of the Spirit to raise men up (i.e. give them life) and to give them understanding which comes from the Father, itself a clear manifestation of his Son (30:23-25). Finally in 30:34-35, there is an unmistakable reference to the insufflation by Jesus of the Holy Spirit as stated in John 20:22.

Summary and Comparison

Justin thinks that man has an innate God-given ability enabling him to grasp what is true. Before Christ came, Justin says that there

¹ Beginning with $\Sigma\epsilon$ in 26:34 and extending through $\overline{\Pi\tau\omicron\omicron\tau\tau\iota}$ in 27:3, the writer has introduced a parenthesis of about six lines of text.

² P. 55.

³ Cf. chapter I for a fuller discussion of the passage, especially of the view that the Holy Spirit is the subject of both perfect verbs in 30:15, 17.

existed two evidences of this God-given ability or power—the Holy Spirit speaking through the Jewish prophets and the Logos found in every race of men. These two elements converge in the incarnate Christ who is at once the full Logos (II. 10:1; 8:3) and the one in whom the Holy Spirit found complete rest, i.e. the one in whom God's purpose was completely fulfilled (D. 87:3-5). By virtue of the logos or power that is innate in man and by a recognition of the truth of God found in Christ (D. 96:2; 110:6) and by contemplation of Christ as the full Logos (II. 8:3), Justin claims that men can be won over to Christ. Justin, however, pays little attention to man's dependence on the Holy Spirit to bring him to the truth. The Divine power which man possesses is what all men receive at birth. Thus, though Justin speaks of Christ as the power of the ineffable Father (II. 10:8), he fails to stress the power of the Holy Spirit and the encounter with truth which the Spirit creates.

The writer of *Ev. Ver.* reflects no Old Testament pneumatology. Nevertheless, like Justin, he posits a spiritual seed or power to men. Unlike Justin, however, he thinks that this seed is in the Father's chosen ones alone. In contrast to the Apologist, the writer of *Ev. Ver.* finds that the spiritual seed needs to be fructified by an outside power, the Holy Spirit. The Spirit alone can make it possible for men to appropriate the truth of the Father as it is revealed in Jesus Christ. The Holy Spirit alone can interpret to men the meaning of God's hidden one, his Son. In this respect, *Ev. Ver.* lies closer to the dynamic element of the New Testament than do the writings of Justin.

D. *The means of appropriation*

1. According to Justin. Justin believes that the means of appropriating truth is to be found in both faith and works. The principle of faith appears in the extensive use the Apologist makes of the two verbs *πίθω* and *πιστεύειν*. There are almost 100 occurrences of the verb *πίθω* in Justin's works, the passive voice appearing almost twice as often as the active. The verb generally refers to the unfolding of a Divine word or a rational argument that persuades men and leads the will to act in accord with that word or argument. So God persuades men and brings them into faith (I. 10:4), the Word persuades them to follow God through his Son (I. 14:1), Christians are persuaded by the prophecies

concerning Christ (I. 30:1), even of a crucified Christ (I. 53:2), and are won over to him so completely that they scorn human glory and defy death itself (II. 10:8). The goal of Justin's writings is avowedly to win over (πειθεῖν) the Roman rulers (e.g. I. 14:3; 32:4; 39:2; 53:1, 12; 57:1; II. 12:6) and Trypho (e.g. D. 29:2; 56:4, 11; 96:2; 44:1; 67:3; 57:4) to the truth of Christianity. In brief, Justin and the Christians whom he represents have been won over to the truth and thus they seek also to win others over to it. Persuasion is possible because man has perception (νόησις) into truth through the presence within of the higher *nous*. The twin verb to πειθεῖν in Justin's works is πιστεῦειν. It occurs about 120 times and in all but six passages is found in the active voice. This is significant. Also significant is its close association with πειθω. B. L. Gildersleeve writes, "Justin often combines the passive of πειθω and πιστεῦω. Generally he uses them in their genetic order, πιστεῦειν being the result of πειθῆναι."¹ Examples of the use of the two verbs together are found in I. 8:2; 17:4; 61:2; D. 47:1. In I. 53:12, the corresponding nouns—πειθῶ and πίστις—occur. The faith or trust of which Justin writes is in God, through the name of Jesus (D. 116:3), in Christ the High Priest (D. 116:1), in things impossible to one's own nature (I. 19:6), in the records concerning the Savior (I. 33:5), in the saving blood of Christ (D. 24:1), in God's voice spoken by the apostles of Christ (D. 119:6), in the truth of the Christian tradition (I. 61:2), and in the mercy of God (D. 107:2). The majority of references, however, refer to faith in Christ. The law, says Justin, pointed beforehand to faith, as may be seen in the types—the faith of Abraham (D. 92:4; 23:4), and that of the Israelites (D. 91:4; I. 60:2-4). The prophets likewise prophesied of faith by saying that the Gentile nations were to believe in Christ (D. 52:4; I. 40:7) and become more true and faithful than the Jews (I. 53:10). Such then is the principle of faith by which men in all generations appropriate truth. The particular cause which the writer represents does not lead him to refer to "justification by faith," but his cause does lead him not only to stress *believing* as the logical sequel to *persuasion* (πειθῶ), but also *believing* as the outward look of faith to Jesus Christ who carries out the Father's will among men.

No less, however, does Justin discern the importance of good works as a means of grasping Divine truth. In I. 2:1, the Apologist

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 120, note 6.

affirms that the one who loves truth (ὁ φιλαλήθης) is under obligation both to speak and practice the things that are just, even at the threat of death. In I. 3:5, he states that to learn the truth without doing it places one before God without excuse. The frequent reference which Justin makes to the verbs βιοῦν, ποιεῖν, πράσσειν, and their congeners, points to the basic importance of man's works for the appropriation of truth. He challenges the rulers to put the deeds (αἱ πράξεις) of a Christian and those of a pagan side by side so that the rulers may readily see where the truth lies (I. 4:6). It is the deed rather than the name that is important, for a name decides nothing apart from the deed which supports the name (I. 4:1). In I. 8:2, Justin goes so far as to say that Christians influence God through their deeds (οἱ τὸν θεὸν δι' ἔργων πείσαντες). The Apologist does not mean that the work of Christ is expendable. His statement must be seen in the larger context which presents the importance, nature, and effect, of Christian practice. Each man is said to go to everlasting salvation or punishment according to the worth of his works (cf. Rom. 2:6-11). Perhaps no reference spells out more the importance of Christian practice for the grasp of Divine truth than I. 14:1-3. The texts of Otto,¹ Gildersleeve,² Blunt,³ Goodspeed,⁴ and Krüger,⁵ all edit this section as containing one continuous sentence. The sentence itself embraces a parenthetical sentence (14:1) which begins with ἀγωνίζονται and ends with ἀγωνιζομένους. It is the parenthesis that provides the key to understanding the primary purpose of the entire passage. Demons, says the writer, make a strenuous effort (ἀγωνίζεσθαι) to hold men as slaves, and they succeed in doing so whenever men make no strenuous effort to obtain their own salvation. To Justin, salvation is an essential part of truth. Accordingly, he affirms that truth does not come easily. Man must bend every effort to obtain it. In our case, says the writer, we forsook (ἀπέστημεν) the demons and continue to follow (ἐπόμεθα) God alone, the unbegotten one, through his Son. Precisely here, the writer introduces four series of contrasts between the old and new economy of Christians. In each case, the contrast shows what it means for

¹ *Op. cit.*, vol. I, part I, 42, 44.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 13.

³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 20-21.

⁴ *Die ältesten Apologeten*, p. 34.

⁵ *Die Apologien Justins des Märtyrers* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1904), pp. 10-11.

converts from paganism to "agonize" that they might obtain the real truth, i.e. God's salvation. It is true that God places the desire to "agonize" within man (ἡμεῖς μετὰ τὸ τῷ λόγῳ πεισθῆναι, "we, after being won over by the Logos," I. 14:1), yet the efforts of Christians thus persuaded are very important. The passage may be analyzed as follows:

- (1) οἱ πάλαι μὲν πορνείαις χαίροντες, νῦν δὲ σωφροσύνην μόνην ἀσπαζόμενοι,
 "We who of old were rejoicing in fornication but now are embracing self-control only,"
- (2) οἱ δὲ καὶ μαγικαῖς τέχναις χρώμενοι, [νῦν] ἀγαθῷ καὶ ἀγεννήτῳ θεῷ ἑαυτοὺς ἀνατεθεικότες,
 "We who also were using magical arts, now the ones who have devoted ourselves to the good and unbegotten God,"
- (3) χρημάτων δὲ καὶ κτημάτων οἱ πόρους παντὸς μᾶλλον στέργοντες, νῦν καὶ ἃ ἔχομεν εἰς κοινὸν φέροντες καὶ παντὶ δεομένῳ κοινωνοῦντες,
 "And also we who above all else were fond of personal property and real estate, now the ones who bring even what we have to a common fund and the ones who share with every one in need,"
- (4) οἱ μισᾶλληλοι δὲ καὶ ἀλληλοφόνοι . . . νῦν μετὰ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν τοῦ χριστοῦ ὁμοδίατοι γινόμενοι, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχθρῶν εὐχόμενοι . . .
 "We who once were hating each other and killing each other . . . now after the appearance of Christ the ones who live together, and the ones who pray for their enemies . . ."

Several observations should be made on the section. First, all of the participles involved in the four contrasting situations are attributive or substantival in nature. That is, they describe in considerable detail the subject "we" which is present in the ending of the two main verbs in 14:1, ἀπέστημεν and ἐπόμεθα. Second, the contrast in three of the four series is made clear by the presence of the adverb νῦν.¹ Third, the passage shows both the decisive nature of the appropriation of truth through faith—by means of the aorist form ἀπέστημεν²—as well as the continuous effort

¹ Editors generally add νῦν to the second series in 14:2, placing the adverb just before the word ἀγαθῷ.

² Cf. also the aorist infinitive in the clause, ἡμεῖς μετὰ τὸ τῷ λόγῳ πεισθῆναι.

toward truth in Christian life—by means of the present indicative verb, ἐπομέθα.

2. According to the writer of *Ev. Ver.* To appropriate truth, says the writer, means to realize one's true nature. Man has forgotten that from all eternity he is God's child. Jesus came into the world to remind man of the fact. Thus man's normal life is lived in forgetfulness of his true nature and origin. The question now is, what means does man use to comprehend the truth of his lofty nature? *Ev. Ver.* contains a definite stress on Divine sovereignty. It is true that the work of the Father embraces all that is, and that "the All" manifests the Divine life (18:33-34) and out of inner necessity tends toward the Father (21:9-10). The spiritual seed, however, is not in all men but in a select group, the *gnostikoi*, whether actual or potential.¹ Precisely here, according to *Ev. Ver.*, one can speak of the means whereby man can appropriate truth. Appropriation of truth basically hinges on the presence of the spiritual seed within man. Hence, on the one hand, the appropriation of truth by the Father's chosen ones is inevitable. If one has gnosis, he naturally shows that he is a "forth-one" from above, and if he is called, he responds, turns to the one who calls him, and rises to him (22:2-7). The Divine call implies the human response. The call and response are two sides of the same coin.

On the other hand, the appropriation of truth by the Father's chosen ones means an active acceptance of God's offer. The verb **𐤆𐤓** "to take" appears a number of times to show that the Gnostics take to themselves, (1) what belongs to them (21:12-13, 22-23), (2) nourishment (41:12), and—above all—(3) gnosis of the one who is hidden (37:37-38), a gnosis which is called the very goal of their life. But, in addition, the appropriation of truth involves a painstaking search and carries with it the definite responsibility of witness. The gnostic "search" for truth appears especially in three different verbs; **𐤆𐤓𐤍** (**𐤍𐤕𐤁-**), "to seek (after)," e.g. 31:32; 24:17; **𐤕𐤟𐤕𐤍 𐤍𐤕𐤟𐤍** (or **𐤍𐤕𐤁-**), "to go around after," e.g. 17:4; 18:12-13; and **𐤕𐤁𐤕𐤟𐤍 𐤁𐤁𐤁𐤁 𐤒𐤁𐤟𐤍** (or **𐤒𐤍𐤟𐤍**), "to stretch out, wait expectantly," e.g. 34:37; 35:2-4; 42:14-15. The intense nature of the verb **𐤆𐤓𐤍** is seen in its use describing

¹ There is no contradiction between this sentence and the previous one—at least to the writer of *Ev. Ver.* He evidently senses that the part can stand for the whole, the same principle that is basic to the proper understanding of Rom. 9-11.

the search Jesus makes for the lost sheep (32:2). It is Jesus who finds the sheep yet he himself is the object (ⲥⲓⲛⲉ¹) of the human search (31:31-32). The language suggests the background of the parables of the pearl and treasure, according to Matt. 13:44-46. The verb ⲕⲱⲧⲉ is a variant of ⲱⲛⲉ. The most intensive verb of the three mentioned above, is ⲥⲁⲙⲧ̅. The word was used to describe the taut position of a martyr either stretched out vertically on a cross or horizontally between pillars.² It is the word used in the Sahidic version of Acts 22:25 to describe the near-flogging of Paul. The Coptic text may be rendered, "They stretched him out with thongs," i.e. they pulled him in opposite directions by means of thongs attached to hands and feet, in readiness for flogging. In *Ev. Ver.*, the word depicts the ardor, the intense expectation for the salvation which comes from above. To men of eager desire, says the writer, belongs the discovery (ⲧⲥⲓⲛⲉ³) of the *pleroma* (34:36).

If the appropriation of Divine truth involves a careful, painstaking search, it also implies a responsibility on the part of the Gnostic, the one who has found the Truth, to proclaim it. Such is the apparent context of the well-known "ethical" section of *Ev. Ver.* (32:31-33:32). Grobel thinks that the section is surprising in a Gnostic work, since Gnostics in general show only a minimal concern in ethics.⁴ Without doubt, however, the ethical imperatives of the section (32:31-33:32) are to be interpreted in the light of the main purpose of *Ev. Ver.* The first two imperatives ⲱⲛⲉⲥⲉ (32:31, 35) set the tone for the others. Since the Gnostics are the perfect day and since the light that is set within them does not go out (32:31-34), they are responsible to speak the truth concerning the Father's gnosis to those who seek it. The indication is that there are those who do not seek it and are thus without hope. Apparently then, those who stumble (33:1-2) are those who

¹ Crum, *A Coptic Dictionary*, p. 82ob, supplies only two references for this word in its noun form; Sir. 13:30^{8a} where the LXX (13:26) has εὐρεσις, and Jer. 45:2⁶⁰ where the LXX has εὐρεμα. To these two references, the five occurrences of the noun in *Ev. Ver.* (17:3; 18:29; 31:31; 35:20; 36:11) may now be added. Each use of the word in *Ev. Ver.* implies that salvation or truth is the object of the human search.

² Cf. Crum, *ibid.*, p. 34ob.

³ Till, *Orientalia*, N.S., 28 (1959), 174, and the notes in *Ev. Ver. Supplementum*, p. 16, suggest the emendation ⲧⲥⲓⲛⲉⲓ, "the coming." The text as it stands, however, makes excellent sense.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. 139, 141, note 377.

tend toward a material life. Again, those who are sick (33:3) are like the sick man of the parable (35:30-35); they lack the fullness of the Father. Those who are prostrate and desire to rise, and, those who are asleep (33:6-8) are the ones who are in the "sleep" of Forgetfulness of their true nature and the Father's gnosis. Thus the entire "ethical" section is apparently allegorical, and simply shows the singleness of purpose that characterizes *Ev. Ver.* from beginning to end. The writer insists that his theme is one of redemption, a redemption revealed by Jesus who draws back the veil of ignorance and reveals the Father's nature and the true destiny of the Gnostic believers in him.

Summary and Comparison

The media for the appropriation of truth, according to Justin, are faith that looks to Christ and the life which one lives as he continues to strive after the truth. The writer of *Ev. Ver.* emphasizes that the appropriation of truth means, (1) Man's careful search for it, (2) The inevitable discovery of it by Gnostics because of the presence of the spiritual seed within, and (3) The responsibility of witnessing to the Divine truth. Justin likewise believes man can comprehend Divine truth by virtue of a seed within—the Logos. He differs, however, in two respects. First, he ascribes the Logos-seed to all men, and second, he affirms that man having the seed, may or may not respond to Divine truth. It is thus that Justin can refer to the positive response, the appropriation of truth, by means of faith and works.

PROPOSITION V

In the writings of Justin and in *Ev. Ver.* there exists a community of truth of Divine origin. It has a life to live now and an ultimate destiny.

A. The community of truth has a Divine origin

1. According to Justin. The community, says Justin, is composed of persons who are persuaded to believe the Christian tradition. They are known variously as the true sons of God (D. 123:9-124:1), the true Israel (D. 123:6-7; 135:2-3), the garments of Christ (I. 32:8), the church, a body, and Christians. The word "church" (ἐκκλησία) is seldom found in Justin's writings (not at all in *Ev. Ver.*). The six references which do occur are all in the Dialogue. Two ref-

erences are in quotation (D. 98:5, 106:2), while two (both in D. 63:5) occur in the Apologist's explanation of Psalm 45:6-11 (44:6-11, LXX), where the church is said to have sprung from Christ's name. In D. 42:3, ἐκκλησία is used of an ordinary assembly (cf. Acts 19:39-40). A reference to the church as a body consisting of many members is found in D. 42:3 where, on the basis of the LXX rendering of Isa. 53:2, ἀνηγγείλαμεν ἐναντίον¹ αὐτοῦ ὡς παιδίον, Justin discovers that there are many witnesses ("we proclaimed"), yet one body ("a child"), i.e. the ἐκκλησία. A final reference (D. 134:3) sets the church in contrast to the synagogue, i.e. "Leah (is) your nation and your synagogue, but Rachel (is) our church." The term "Christians" is much more frequent in Justin's writings than the word church. Justin is well aware of the fact that the name is used falsely by followers of Simon Magus, Menander, and Marcion (I. 26:6). Nevertheless it is a good name (cf. the word play of χρηστός and χριστός in I. 4:1).² Moreover, it is a name that links Christians to Jesus Christ, the one to whom they owe their origin. Thus in D. 63:5, the writer asserts that Christians are ἐξ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ, i.e. Christ is the name they share.

Justin has no doubt but that the community of truth is of Divine origin. He does not quote the famous Matthaean passage on the birth of the church (Matth. 16:16-18) though he does refer to the revelation of the Father made to Simon Peter on that occasion (D. 100:4). He states a number of ways, however, by which the Divine origin of the community is made manifest.

(1) Justin affirms that Christians are those who have been made new through Christ (I. 61:1), born anew (I. 61:3, 4, 10), and illumined (I. 61:12, 13; 65:1; D. 122:3, 5) on the basis of the name (ἐπ' ὀνόματος) of the triune God (I. 61:3, 13, cf. I. 65:3; 67:2). The Divine agency is made definite by the use of three passive verb forms (καινοποιηθέντες, ἀναγεννῶνται, φωτιζόμενος). The first word is apparently a general term to describe persons from all levels of Christian experience. They are persons "made new" by the agency of Christ. The next two terms (ἀναγεννῶνται, φωτιζόμενος) appear in the context of Christian baptism. Goode-nough expresses well the tension found in Justin with respect to baptism when he observes that Justin regarded baptism as a

¹ Justin has ἐνώπιον instead of ἐναντίον.

² Gildersleeve, *op. cit.*, p. 111, note 4, and Otto, *op. cit.*, vol. I, part I, 14 f., mention references to this paranomasia in other ancient writers.

regenerative rite but that he did not regard it as essential to salvation.¹ At times, Justin refers to regeneration or illumination as preceding Christian baptism. His description of his own conversion (D. 8:1) resulting from the words of the old man by the sea definitely implies regeneration and enlightenment. He says, "Immediately a fire was kindled in my soul and love of the prophets and of those men who are friends of Christ was holding [reading εἶχε instead of ἔχει] me." In the clause, "those who have been enlightened through Jesus" (D. 122:1), the writer suggests the principle of faith rather than the rite of baptism. Furthermore, in D. 29:1, by the term "baptism" itself, Justin may be referring to faith in Christ. The text is to be rendered, "What then yet to me, having been witnessed to by God, is the message of circumcision? What need [do I have] of that baptism [i.e. Jewish proselyte baptism] having been baptized by the Holy Spirit?" Both the contrast which he draws between his own experience and that of proselyte baptism, and the emphasis he places on the Holy Spirit, suggest that Justin is not thinking in terms of water baptism. Yet, the fact remains that Justin definitely links the new birth to water baptism. The new birth occurs as the candidates for baptism are brought to the place where there is water and baptized on the authority of the name of the Father and of the Savior and of the Holy Spirit (I. 61:3). Four items stand out for mention in his treatment of the ἀναγέννησις. First, Justin shows that the new birth is an important part of the heritage of the Christian faith. "According to the manner of the new birth whereby we ourselves were born anew, they are born anew." Second, in words strongly reminiscent of Jesus' conversation with Nicodemus (John 3:6, 4), Justin speaks of the sinful condition inherent in the first birth and the impossibility of human effort to effect any change. Third, he quotes somewhat loosely the word of Jesus on the necessity of the new birth (John 3:3, 5). Fourth, he accents the choice which the new convert makes in favor of the new birth (I. 61:10). Together with the experience of the new birth, those being baptized receive enlightenment in their minds (I. 61:12, cf. D. 122:1, 3). Goodenough² and earlier Otto³ thought that the term φωτισμός was taken from the mystery religions. In Justin's view, the term definitely means a new insight

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 266 f.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 257.

³ *Op. cit.*, vol. I, part I, 168.

that the baptized ones receive into the content of the Christian faith.¹ The present participle φωτιζόμενος refers to illumination received during the baptismal service itself (I. 61:13), the aorist participle φωτισθείς, to the decisive nature of that baptismal experience (I. 65:1), while the perfect participle πεφωτισμένος (D. 122:1) links the punctiliar and durative actions together, i.e. those who were once baptized are ever afterward known as "the enlightened ones through Jesus." Therefore, Goodenough goes beyond the evidence in affirming that the φωτισμός in baptism means for Justin only that the convert has a new start in life.² This is only part of Goodenough's idea that salvation, according to Justin, "is actually received only when at the judgment the Christian is taken from the ranks of doomed humanity to be included in the number of the blessed. . . . Purity of life is a prerequisite for salvation, not a result of it."³ To be sure, Justin sounds a strong moralistic note, but the community of truth (i.e. the Christians) is no less a fact. The tension which is present in Justin's writings should be maintained.

(2) Justin says that Jesus Christ is himself the new and eternal covenant of God with men (D. 11:2-5; 122:5), which God announced beforehand and which he alone ratified. In D. 122:5, Justin differentiates between the old and new covenants and their proselytes. As one might expect, the occurrences of προσήλυτος (also προσήλυσις D. 28:2) are all in the Dialogue. Generally, the word "proselyte" denoted the Gentile who came to the Jewish faith accepting all the entrance requirements. Justin uses the word in such a way (D. 80:1) in the mouth of Trypho. In D. 122:2, however, the word is used in Justin's own description of proselytes who join hands with the Jews in their unbelief in Christ and hatred of Christians. The Apologist also, uniquely, applies the word in a new way. In D. 23:3 and 28:2, he refers to Trypho as a potential proselyte of the Christian faith, while in D. 122:5, the word connotes Gentile Christians. In the context (122:3), Justin cites the words of Isa. 42:6, "I will appoint you for a covenant of a nation, for a light of Gentiles," and affirms that the words refer to Christ and to the enlightened Gentiles. Some of Trypho's friends protest strenuously,

¹ Cf. C. Story, "Justin's Apology I. 62-64: Its Importance for the Author's Treatment of Christian Baptism," *VC*, XVI, no. 3/4 (1962), 175 f.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 267 f.

³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 250 f., but cf. pp. 250-253 in their entirety.

saying that the reference in the prophet is to proselytes illumined by the Jewish law (D. 122:4). In answer, Justin affirms that if the Jewish law had the power to illuminate the nations, as well as the Jews who possess the law, no new covenant would have been needed. God, however, has announced a new covenant and an eternal law, denoting not the old law and its proselytes, but "Christ and his proselytes, that is, Gentiles whom he enlightened." There are several important points in the passage that bear on the subject of the Divine origin of the community of truth. First, Christ illumines (ἐφώτισεν, 122:5): the nations are illumined (122:3). Second all Christians are "proselytes" with respect to the Christian faith. Thus, in 122:5, Gentile Christians are viewed as proselytes, but in 23:3 and 28:2, the word has in view potential Jewish converts. G. Archambault alludes to the meaning in the last two references but he does not speak of the special nuance of meaning which Justin gives in 122:5.¹ Since "proselyte" implies that a covenant has been established and is already in operation, D. 122:5 lays stress on the Divine nature of the covenant, i.e. that it is fully ratified apart from any human endeavor. To be a proselyte, a "comer-to," means metaphorically that one comes to the place where God through Christ has established his covenant and is carrying it out. Third, the new law or covenant is Christ (122:5). Such is the meaningful way in which Justin contrasts the old with the new—"the old law and its proselytes, Christ and his proselytes." Fourth, the nations are Christ's inheritance (D. 122:6). In addition to the rhetorical way in which Justin expresses the idea, he cites Psa. 2:7-8. "These statements," he says, "pertain to Christ and the Gentiles" (D. 123:1).

2. According to the writer of *Ev. Ver.* The writer of *Ev. Ver.*—like Justin—is convinced that there is a community of truth of Divine origin. Numerous terms in *Ev. Ver.* reflect the idea. The community of truth is the fruit (28:7) of the Father's heart no less than is the Son himself (18:25; 23:35). They are the words of his meditation (37:3), the Father's root (42:35), his plantings (36:36), and the Truth itself (42:25-26) because they are of the Father of Truth (16:33). Three descriptions, however, appear in *Ev. Ver.* with special detail.

a. The community is made up of "little children" (19:28-29), "sons of the Father" (33:39, cf. 43:20, 22-24; 32:38-39), or

¹ *Op. cit.*, II, 105.

"sons of the Name" (38:28). To these references, one should add the two parables considered above—the parable of the father and his offspring (19:10-14), and the parable of the children from the adult man (27:10-15). This descriptive relationship has a peculiar attraction to the writer for he finds ample illustration of it in human society as well as in the Father-Son relationship. The noun $\overline{\text{HKEKOTI}}$ (19:28) is found nowhere else in *Ev. Ver.* It occurs within the context of a section beginning abruptly with the second word of 19:17, $\text{A}\overline{\text{C}}\overline{\text{Y}}\overline{\text{W}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{E}}$. It has been suggested to the writer that the abrupt appearance of Jesus described in 19:17, "He became a guide," is comparable to the beginning of Marcion's gospel.¹ The appearance of Jesus strikes an answering chord in the hearts of the little children. As "little children," they have a special relationship to God (cf. Matt. 11:25; 18:2-6); they have the Father's gnosis and the Father has a special claim upon them. The passage, "They learned the forms of the Father's face" (19:31-32) poses a problem. The critical notes of the *Ev. Ver.* text,² suggest a connection with Matth. 18:10, with several references in *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, and with features in the Marcosian sect as reported by Irenaeus. In all of the references, angels are said to contemplate the Father's face. *Ev. Ver.*, however, mentions no angels nor does the writer use the verb "contemplate." If, as is likely, the Greek word underlying the Coptic word of the text of 19:31-32 is $\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{R}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{S}}\overline{\text{W}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{N}}$, the meaning of $\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{R}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{S}}\overline{\text{W}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{N}}$ (Coptic, $\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{R}}\overline{\text{O}}$) in this text may be "appearance" or "person." Thus the sense may be, "They learned the fashioned works of the Father's person," that is, the characteristic ways in which the Father appears. The description, "sons of the Name" (38:28-29) is found in a section of *Ev. Ver.* (38:6-40:29) containing a long and sustained emphasis. The descriptive title is one of the most effective ways which the writer uses to show what he believes to be the truly Divine origin of the community of truth. To understand what the description means, one observes that the idea of the writer revolves around two basic principles. First, the Name is the mystery of the Divine nature (cf. $\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{S}}\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{H}}\overline{\text{R}}\overline{\text{I}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{N}}$, 38:18-19). Second, the Name is become manifest in a Son ($\overline{\text{C}}\overline{\text{Y}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{Q}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{E}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{L}}\overline{\text{Q}}\overline{\text{H}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{Y}}\overline{\text{H}}\overline{\text{R}}\overline{\text{E}}$, 38:23-24). The first principle is supported by three alpha privative adjectives, all having reference to the Name ($\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{H}}\overline{\text{E}}\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{C}}$,

¹ Cf. Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, IV. 7:1.

² P. 58.

"invisible," 38:17, **οὐαττ**† **ρεη** **αρας**, "unnameable," 40:16-17, and **οὐαττεορας**, "unutterable," 40:17). Primarily the adjectives refer to the Old Testament Jewish faith, especially to texts such as Exod. 6:3; Judg. 13:17-18; Isa. 9:6 where the name conceals the mystery of the Divine person. The second principle is Christian in its content. The Name that is a mystery, invisible, unnameable, unutterable, is become manifest (qual. **γοσανρ** **αδαλ**) in a Son (38:11-12, 23-24; 39:23; 40:9-10). The textual notes of the *Ev. Ver.* text¹ compare the representation of Valentinus' teaching by Clement of Alexandria in a passage to be rendered, "One is good whose manifestation [**φανέρωσις**] through the Son (is) boldness."² The word "son" with the indefinite article (*Ev. Ver.* 38:23-24) may be compared to the anarthrous construction **ἐν υἱῷ** of Hebr. 1:2 where the attention of the writer centers on the *nature* of the Son. The Divine nature, according to *Ev. Ver.*, is concealed in the mystery of the Name but it is revealed in one who has the character of a Son. Apparently, the communication of the Name connotes the communication of nature. That is, "sons of the Name" must surely point to the Divine origin and nature of the community of truth, according to the writer. "The name of a thing is the real essence behind, and denoted by, its name."³ The community is owned by the Father since his Name continues to abide (**νεσματῆ**, 38:29) upon their head (38:36-37). The idea approximates that which is found in Rev. 3:12; 14:1; 22:4. On the other hand, the community rests and depends on the Father's name (38:31-32, cf. John 1:12). The importance of the name to the writer is seen in 39:11-19. Men are divided into two classes—those who have no name and thus have no being, and those who have both name and being. Basically then, the phrase "sons of the Name" means that the community is of Divine origin, that the members bear the stamp of the Divine character simply because the Name is manifest in a Son.⁴

¹ P. 58. ² *Strom.* II, 114:3.

³ K. Grobel, *op. cit.*, p. 185, note 574.

⁴ It seems clear that, in the function of the Name, *Ev. Ver.* reflects an emphasis of the gospel of John. S. Arai, *op. cit.*, pp. 66-70, examines rabbinic texts, the book of Enoch, the apocalypse of Abraham, Pistis Sophia, and the Hermetic Corpus, and discovers that in none of these documents does "the Name" function as a mediator of revelation. The connection with the gospel of John, however, is clear. Arai cites John 17:5; 12:23, 28 and quotes Odeberg's commentary on the Fourth Gospel to the effect that Jesus not only carries the Divine name but he *is* the name.

b. The community of truth constitutes "the living book of those who live" (19:35-36). The book is Divine in origin (19:36-20:1). While it became manifest in the heart of the little ones (19:34-35), it stands written (qual. $\epsilon\tau\chi\eta\sigma$ from $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon\iota$) in the thought and in the mind of the Father (cf. also 23:3-18). The community travels the path which Jesus blazed (cf. 16:35-36; 20:23-24; 22:35-36), its members comprising little children who come to Jesus (19:28-30). As a living book, they manifest their true nature to the world. At first glance, the idea seems to reflect a text such as 2 Cor. 3:2-3 where the Corinthian believers are described as a letter of Christ in that they are continually displayed to the world (cf. $\phi\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$ in 2 Cor. 3:3). A similar outward manifestation is apparent in *Ev. Ver.* 20:6-9. That is, in the idea of the living book, *Ev. Ver.* reveals a Biblical concept, but with striking differences. First, while the writer assigns decisive significance to the historical manifestation of Jesus, he almost eliminates any previous manifestation of the purpose of God in the world (20:6-9). To be sure, 19:36-20:3 indicates that before the foundation of the All (cf. Eph. 1:4) the book was written within the inner part of the Incomprehensible One. Yet there is nothing manifest prior to the coming of the book into the midst. The assertion probably contains an anti-Jewish element. A similar element is present in 23:3 ff. where the writer directs his argument against a Jewish type of exegesis in which men think that true understanding means to know the significance of each letter.¹ Second, while the writer states that the book is a Divine manifestation, he means a manifestation not of God's work but of the nature of his chosen ones. God brings gnosis to men, the gnosis that they are his children, a gnosis which becomes their very life. The idea is quite far removed from the New Testament view of being "fellow workers of God" (1 Cor. 3:9, cf. also the superior reading of D* 33 d e Ambst Pelag, according to the Nestle apparatus of 1 Thess. 3:2). Third, *Ev. Ver.* shows that the community of truth can act as the manifestation of the ineffable God in the world, not so much by virtue of any transforming redemption which God works in their behalf, but by virtue of their own inherent Divine nature which comes to light with the appearance of Jesus.

c. The community of truth is the Father's aroma (33:33-35:23). The passage contains a dynamic, moving emphasis that is lacking

¹ Justin similarly protests against this kind of exegesis (cf. D. 113:2-3).

in the other two main descriptions given above. The aroma belongs to the Father. It leaves his presence, becomes mixed with matter (34:5-6), but through the agency of the Holy Spirit (34:10-11) it is drawn back to the Father (34:12-13) to become one with him (34:13-14). By the singular form of the noun $\epsilon\tau\alpha\epsilon\iota$, the writer portrays the aroma (= the community) in its unity or oneness with the Father (34:1, 4, 6, etc); by the plural form (34:26), he denotes the community of truth in the various persons who comprise it. A peculiar feature of the parable appears in 34:10-12, i.e. the aroma is identified with the Holy Spirit. Schenke¹ followed by Grobel² (cf. the French and English translations of *Ev. Ver. Supplementum*³) omits the noun $\nu\epsilon\tau\alpha\epsilon\iota$ at the end of 34:10 thinking that it is a case of dittography (the noun occurs twice in 34:10). Till, however, maintains that there is no dittography in 34:10, but haplography in 34:11. He thinks that in 34:11 the copula $\nu\epsilon$ is to be supplied before $\nu\epsilon\pi\eta\lambda\alpha$.⁴ If Till is correct, the puzzling question may be asked; If the sons of the Father constitute his aroma, how can the Holy Spirit be the aroma? Furthermore, if the Holy Spirit is the aroma, how can he at the same time be the means by which the aroma is drawn back to the Father? Probably the writer did not raise these questions. At any rate, he has made no clear distinction between the community of truth and the Holy Spirit, suggesting thereby, a Stoic point of view. At the same time, the description as a whole indicates, for the writer, how the community of truth originates in God.

Summary and Comparison

According to Justin, there exists a fellowship of truth of Divine origin. It is composed of Christians, those who have been illumined or made new or regenerated by Christ who is himself God's new and eternal covenant with men.

To the writer of *Ev. Ver.* also, there is a community of truth of Divine origin, a community which he describes as "children" or "sons of the Name," as "the living book," and as "the Father's aroma." Whereas the descriptive terms in Justin's writings stress

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 49.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 151, note 427.

³ Pp. 5, 31.

⁴ *Orientalia*, N.S., 28 (1959), 174. Cf. also Till's German translation in *Ev. Ver. Supplementum*, p. 25.

the change wrought by God in men thereby bringing a fellowship of truth into being, *Ev. Ver.* is concerned with the existential nature of the community. Its true nature becomes manifest as the veil of ignorance is withdrawn and it discovers that it is already in the Father.

B. The community of truth has a life to live in the world

1. According to Justin. Justin believes that the community of truth, the Christian church, finds its life and unity not only in what it *is* but what it *does*. Through the coming of Christ, the Divine Logos, it is made conscious of God's redemptive work for it. Unitedly it gives expression to God's work by performing the sacraments and by observing the Lord's day.

a. Baptism. Justin claims not only a close link between baptism and a believer's new birth but also a vital unity between the sacrament and the believing community. Throughout I. 61-67, Justin speaks in the first person (e.g. ἀνεθήκαμεν, I. 61:1; ἀνεγεννήθημεν, I. 61:3; γεγεννήμεθα, I. 61:10; ἄγομεν, 65:1; ἀσπαζόμεθα, 65:2; λαμβάνομεν, 66:2; ἀναμιμνήσκομεν, 67:1; ἀνιστάμεθα, 67:5). In one sense the use of the first person plural of the verb is expected and natural, for the document is an *apologia* in behalf of persecuted Christians with whom Justin senses his identity (cf. I. 1:1, "one of them"). Nevertheless, the consistent use of the first person plural throughout I. 61-67 implies also a unity that is inherent in the community. Into this community new converts come. They are surrounded by a living fellowship; "they are led by us to where there is water," I. 61:3. The change from the plural ὅσοι ἂν πειθῶσι in 61:2 to the singular πεπεισμένος in 65:1, enhances the personal nature of this fellowship. From a comparison of I. 61 and I. 65, it is clear that the baptismal service (I. 61) and the church gathering (I. 65) transpire in two different places.¹ The truth underscoring the unity of the church appears also in the fact that the "church" gathering has been in progress while the baptismal service in another locale² has taken place. The prayers of the church ascend to God for the enlightened one (ὁ φωτισθείς, 65:1) and for the Christian church in general, to the end that its members may be good administrators and guardians of those things which have been

¹ The periphrastic perfect construction ἐνθα συνηγμένοι εἰσὶ (I. 65:1) makes the point certain.

² Perhaps at an open stream, as Goodenough suggests (*op. cit.*, p. 271).

commanded, and that they may be saved with an eternal salvation. C. C. Richardson thinks that πολιτευταί (65:1) should not be taken as the equivalent of πολῖται, "citizens," but, because the word is herein joined with the word φύλακες, it has the meaning of "magistrates."¹ That is, the Christian community assumes the responsibility for seeing that the laws of Christ are put into practice within the fellowship. Following the prayers, the sacrament is concluded with the kiss of charity or peace (I. 65:2) such as is mentioned in Rom. 16:16; 1 Cor. 16:20; 2 Cor. 13:12; 1 Thess. 5:26.

b. The Lord's supper. The sacrament of the eucharist (εὐχαριστία, I. 66:1) figures in a significant way in I. 65-67. It is described in I. 65:3-5 as the concluding part of the baptismal service, its meaning is expounded in I. 66, while in I. 67:4-5, it is presented as the concluding part of the Sunday worship service. The references to the Eucharist in the Dialogue (41:1-3; 70:3-4; 117:1-3) are also important. All of the passages have received considerable attention from scholars.² It is necessary, however, to observe that—like the sacrament of baptism—the eucharist reflects the living unity of the Christian community. Briefly, the unity appears in the common "Amen" of the people after the thanksgiving prayer (I. 65:3), in the concern that absent members, as well as those present, share in the eucharistic elements (I. 65:5), in the instruction given to the new converts before partaking of the Eucharist (I. 66:1), in the vital link which the Eucharist provides with the apostles of Jesus, the report of its institution being found in their "memoirs called gospels"³ (I. 66:3), and, above all, in the common nourishment for blood and flesh which the community receives through partaking of the eucharistic food (I. 66:2). In D. 41:1-3, an important item is added. Justin finds that the Eucharist combines the two great doctrines of Scripture—creation and redemption. That is, the thanksgiving prayer is directed to God because he created the world and all that is therein for the sake of man, and because he sets men free from evil into which they have fallen, and completely overthrows principalities and powers through the one who came to be subject to suffering. The importance

¹ "Ap. I. 65¹—The Meaning of πολιτευταί," *HTR*, 29 (1936), 89 ff.

² J. Donaldson, *op. cit.*, II, 311-316; Goodenough, *op. cit.*, 271-276; the bibliography in J. Quasten, *Patrology*, I (Maryland: The Newman Press, 1950), 218-219.

³ Cf. the article by R. Heard, "ἀπομνημονεύματα in Papias, Justin, and Irenaeus," *NTS*, I (1954-55), 123-125.

of the passage is abundantly clear. The Christian community learns that the world belongs to God and that it is good. The fact that men are involved in evil does not cancel out God's good creation. It simply means that, in view of Christ's sufferings, God who created the world for man can now redeem man from evil and make it possible for him to live a meaningful life in the world. Justin is explicit in affirming that the life of the Christian community, bound together by the sacraments, is a witness to the world in what it does. The very fact that, in a writing addressed to Roman rulers and people, he sets forth candidly and in detail the unity of sacramental life in the community of Christ, bears a testimony to the world. He evidently desires that the world be fully informed of the truth and that none be able to malign it. It is a fact that Christians were maligned with respect to their ritualistic practices. Trypho knew of such charges against the Christians and yet he felt that they were unworthy of credence (D. 10:1-2). In the First Apology, Justin says that it would be a sin for him to omit the explanation (ἐξήγησις) of Christian ritualistic life (I. 61:1). The implication is quite clear. By its common life in the sacraments the community claims to be God's true people, his true Israel. That is, not only in what it is, but in what it does, it bears witness to the world.

c. The Lord's day. The Sunday worship service reveals the corporate nature of the Christian community. Justin indicates the fact by the expression ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό (I. 67:3), a phrase used several times in the first two chapters of Acts (1:15; 2:1, 44, 47) to describe the essential unity of the primitive church. The service itself consists of five main parts; a reading of the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets, instruction by the president intended to encourage the people to imitate the good things which they have heard from the Word, prayers and thanksgiving by the people while standing, the celebration of the Eucharist, and a free will collection of gifts to be used for the poor and needy. The significance of the day in which the worship service is held (I. 67:8) has been referred to earlier (pp. 121-123).

2. According to the writer of *Ev. Ver.* For the writer of *Ev. Ver.* the coming of Jesus Christ, the Divine Logos, makes the community of truth conscious of its existence and true unity in the gnosis of the Father. In the experience of gnosis, it finds its *raison d'être*. At the same time there is a Divine purpose which the community

serves in the world. In contrast to Justin's writings, *Ev. Ver.* contains no definite indication of either of the two Christian sacraments. The one occurrence of the word $\mu\alpha\tau$, "water" (34:20), has no bearing on baptism. Strangely enough, E. Segelberg titles *Ev. Ver.* "A confirmation homily."¹ He thinks that *Ev. Ver.* gives evidence of three kinds of rites, preparative, baptismal, and chrismatory, the stress being on the third type. A few samples of Segelberg's approach to *Ev. Ver.* should be observed. In 33:19-21, he finds an indication of exorcism, an act preparatory to baptism.² In the stretching out of the hand (30:19 ff.), he discovers that the priest acts to raise the prostate initiate and lead him into the mystery of baptism or chrism,³ while some "vague evidence for the existence of an investiture in the baptismal act" exists, says Segelberg, in 20:30-37.⁴ Moreover, he thinks that the exsufflation and insufflation (30:34; 34:25 f.; 26:28) may refer either to the chrism or to the preparatory rites.⁵ He concludes thus: (1) Baptism, though not explicitly mentioned in *Ev. Ver.*, is there, and (2) *Ev. Ver.* "seems to be a homily, for use at confirmation, an act probably in time and space separated from the baptism in water."⁶ A serious question needs to be raised over Segelberg's approach. It is probably true that *Ev. Ver.* is a homily and that 36:13-35 contains some reference to the rite of chrismation. The danger, however, facing any interpreter of *Ev. Ver.* is that of reading into the document what is not there. With regard to the various passages of *Ev. Ver.* to which Segelberg appeals, the context of each qualifies fundamentally the interpretation suggested. Thus, 33:19-21 must be seen as a part of a section of *Ev. Ver.* containing no fewer than sixteen imperatives. In 30:19, the context determines the subject of the verb to be the Holy Spirit, not a priest. In 20:30-37, context shows that the investiture—whatever it may mean essentially—refers not primarily to the Gnostic but to Jesus. And finally, the exsufflation and insufflation of 30:34 has for its background John 20:22⁷ while 34:25-26 and

¹ "*Evangelium Veritatis*—a confirmation homily and its Relation to the Odes of Solomon," *Orientalia Suecana*, VIII (1959), 3-42.

² *Ibid.*, p. 17.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 37.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

⁷ Cf. the *notes critiques* of the *Ev. Ver.* text, p. 57.

36:28 are only illustrations and need to be recognized as such. Thus, according to *Ev. Ver.* the community of truth finds its living unity not in sacraments but in the experience of the Father's nature.

The central principle of the life of the community, according to *Ev. Ver.*, is knowledge of the nature of God. That is, it experiences the Father's gnosis, a gnosis which comes through the cross (18:24-26) making Jesus meaningful to the fellowship (31:30-31), and finding its basic expression in the oneness of the life of the community. This oneness of the community is described as a complete book (23:12-13) written through Oneness (23:14-15) or through the Father (23:15-16). The entire passage (23:3-18) merits close attention. It is preceded by a section (22:20-23:3) in which Jesus is said to rescue the chosen ones from Error's grip and to manifest the Father's will. It is followed by a hymn concerning the Father's Logos (23:18-33) and a description of the work of the Logos among the All (23:33-24:9). These indications from the context show the close way in which Jesus Christ (= the Logos) and the community of Truth (= the living book) are joined together. The book is not material but spiritual. It denotes the community, itself a mirror in which the oneness of the Father is said to be reflected (cf. 23:13-16). The will of God which Jesus manifested (22:35-36) is said to find its fulfillment in this book. *Ev. Ver.* reveals a striking emphasis on oneness. The source of all being lies in the fact that God is one. Thus there exists a connection of some kind between the various letters of the book while they produce the impression of being one complete book written through Oneness (23:14-15).

According to *Ev. Ver.*, there is a Divine purpose which the community of truth serves in the world. The purpose is seen in several ways:

(1) First, the fact that God actively carries out his will in the cosmos is evident in 22:33-36. The sense of the negative of the perfect followed by the "positive" perfect is significant in this text. The passage reads, *ἐνεθε γαρ ἐνεῶπερι ἀβαλ ἡρητῷ ἡσι πεφοτωσε αφοτανῶτῷ γαρ ἀβαλ*, "For thus [at that time] his will had not gone forth outside of him: for [now] he has manifested it." Quite definitely the author contrasts a pre-cosmic time when God's will was inoperative or static with a cosmic time when he manifested his will. He manifested his will among all

things ("the All") by means of his Logos (22:33-23:3) and by means of his chosen ones, i.e. his perfect or complete book (23:2-16).

(2) Second, the writer recognizes a Divine purpose at work in the cosmos in the form of a conflict between Oneness, i.e. God, and *Schema*, i.e. the conditions under which this world operates (25:3-11). Such is the evident meaning of a curious passage. "For now their works [i.e. of Oneness and *Schema*] are set against one another [lit. "to them"], being equal" (25:7-8). The text does no more than hint at some basic tension or conflict in the cosmos, though both the preceding and following context shows that the victory lies with God.

(3) Third, the writer recognizes a Divine purpose at work in the cosmos by means of purpose clauses introduced by *ὅνα* ($A_2 = \text{ὅνα}$). Three of these clauses (18:5-7; 23:16-18; 24:14-17) contain the same emphasis, i.e. "that the Father might be known." In each case, the Father is seen to accomplish his purpose in the world through the Logos and the community of Truth that comes to know him. There is, however, an important qualification; it is not what the community *does* but what it *is* that bears witness to the Father.

Summary and Comparison

The writings of Justin reveal that the life of the Christian community is bound together by the observance of the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper and by the worship service on the Lord's day. Through the sacrament of baptism, the new convert enters the fellowship, while in the Eucharist, the believing community discovers that its life is linked to the two important truths—creation and redemption. By its common life expressed in these sacraments the Christian fellowship bears witness to the world.

Ev. Ver. reveals a fellowship of truth which finds its oneness in the gnosis of the Father. The document shows, however, no clear indication of either of the two Christian sacraments. The central purpose of the fellowship, according to the writer, is to possess the gnosis of the Father's nature. The community of truth apparently bears witness to the world. It witnesses, however, not so much by what it *does* but by what it *is*. The difference from the fellowship described by Justin is very sharp. The believers, says Justin, demonstrate the truth of the gospel in the *act* of baptism and by *participation* in the Eucharist.

C. The community of truth has an ultimate destiny

1. According to Justin. Justin believes that the Christian community is eschatological in nature. It awaits the second coming of Christ and subsequent events. Goodenough has pointed out at length the uncritical character of various details in Justin's eschatology.¹ At the same time it is important to discern a consistency in the Apologist as he describes general aspects of the future life.

a. First, the Christian community, according to Justin, awaits the second coming of Christ. One of Justin's favorite words to express the idea is προσδοκᾶν, "to expect, look for" (cf. I. 8:3; II:1-2; 18:6; 32:4; 42:4; 56:1).² Furthermore, by prediction and type, the Old Testament is said to set forth the two comings of Christ, the first in humiliation, the second in glory.³ Several sections of Justin's Dialogue and the First Apology deal with the issue (cf., e.g. D. 32-54; III-III4; 138-139; I. 50-52).⁴

b. Second, according to Justin, the Christian community awaits the resurrection of the flesh (I. 18-19; D. 80:1-4), the final judgment (I. 28:1; 52:3-12; D. 36:1; 58:1), and Christ's reign. He reigns now, says Justin, by virtue of his resurrection and ascension (compare his interpretation of Psalm 24 in D. 36), but he will reign in the future in a rebuilt Jerusalem (D. 81).⁵ Justin adds that many Christians of a pure and godly mind do not accept a rule of Christ on earth (D. 80:2).⁶

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 278-291, especially p. 291.

² For the idea of expectancy, compare the teaching of Jesus (e.g. Matt. 16:27; Mark 13:26), of Paul (e.g. 1 Thess. 1:9-10; 4:13-18; Phil. 3:20-21), and of John (Rev. 1:7 *et al.*).

³ In his use of the term παρουσία, Justin differs from the New Testament idiom. In the New Testament, when the term παρουσία is used religiously, it is confined to the return of Jesus. Justin uses the term for Jesus' incarnation as well as for his return (cf. D. 14:8).

⁴ Compare likewise Luke 24:26-27; Mark 12:1-12; Acts 3:18-21; 1 Pet. 1:10-11 and the way in which "day of Christ" (1 Cor. 1:8) or "day of the Lord" (1 Thess. 5:2; 2 Thess. 2:2) apparently means "day of Yahweh" (e.g. Joel 2:1 ff., Amos 5:18-20; Jer. 46:10).

⁵ Justin "exegetes" Rev. 20 where a millennium is treated but he omits other New Testament passages where Christ's reign is not linked to a millennium (e.g. Matt. 19:28; 1 Cor. 15:20-28).

⁶ The text of D. 80:2 is curious. The apologist claims to have informed Trypho on this issue at an earlier time. Yet, in the Dialogue as we have it, there is no earlier information given. Possibly a part of the Dialogue has been lost (compare A. L. Williams, *Justin Martyr, The Dialogue with Trypho*, pp. xviii and 169).

2. According to *Ev. Ver.* The writer of *Ev. Ver.* believes that the community of truth has an ultimate destiny—in the Father. The obvious question, however, is: Does *Ev. Ver.* give evidence of eschatology?

If eschatology be taken to mean a series of end-events or the culmination of a Divine process on earth which expresses God's concern for mankind in the age that is and the coming age, then *Ev. Ver.* contains no eschatology. It claims that Truth originates in the Father of Truth (16:33) and finds its final expression in the community of Truth (42:25-26) which is said to be in the Father (42:26-30). The destiny of the community appears, however, in a number of ways.

a. First, the aroma (= the sons of the Father) which has become mixed with matter is drawn back to the Father and sinks down in his aroma (33:39-34:14).

b. Second, the Father has a place (τοπος) and sends his Son forth to speak of that place and to effect the return of his chosen ones by removing them from this place (= the world) and granting them nourishment from that place (40:30-41:12). The text quite clearly distinguishes between "that place in which he [i.e. the Gnostic] stood" (41:9-10), and "that place [i.e. the Father's] of which he tastes" (41:10-11).

c. Third, there is a "withheld completeness" which the Father eventually gives to those who return to him (18:29-19:7). The passage is difficult but its general sense is clear. The fact that it contains two perfect forms of the verb $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\chi\omega$, one "positive" and one "negative," facilitates its exegesis. The Father *has given* ($\alpha\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\chi\epsilon\iota$, 18:28) joy to those who have discovered his gnosis: he *has not given* ($\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\chi\epsilon\iota$, 18:37) completeness to the All. The writer seems to sense the obvious tension. He denies that it is due to any jealousy on the Father's part (18:38-39) and uses a rhetorical question to enforce his point. "Indeed," he says, "what jealousy [could there be] between him and his members?" (18:39-40). Therefore, what the Father withholds is for a purpose, i.e. that the All may return to him for completeness. The return is necessary for two reasons. First, since completeness exists only in the Father (21:8-9), to give completeness or perfection to the world as it is would mean to posit completeness apart from the Father—an impossible idea. Completeness belongs only to God. Second, to give completeness to the world now would mean a static universe

with no goal whatever. The writer thus insists that there is movement of the universe toward the Father, certainly a strong Biblical emphasis. God must give the completeness; the creatures cannot and do not bring it about by their own efforts. There is also, however, a non-Biblical emphasis. While the completeness in the Bible as in *Ev. Ver.* is a gift, it is altogether something new which man has never had; in *Ev. Ver.*, it is a completeness that man recovers, i.e. it is already potential in man.

d. Fourth, the balance or tension that now prevails between the structure of the world (*schema*) and Oneness, will be resolved by God (25:7-8). That is, God will banish completely all opposition. No fewer than four times does the writer use the compound verb **ἔωλ ἀδαλ** and indicate thereby that ignorance (24:35-36), darkness (24:37-38), lack (25:2), and *schema* (25:4-5) will disappear. The "event" will occur, he says:

(1) When Oneness will perfect the spaces (25:9-11). If **καεῖτ** (25:10) be taken in a spatial sense, the meaning is that the Divine Oneness will perfect (= bring into Divine Oneness) all modes of existence—whether celestial or terrestrial.

(2) When each one receives himself (25:11-12), i.e. recovers that which was lost but which belongs to his original nature.

(3) When each one by means of gnosis is purified out of diversity into Oneness. Gnosis ("it" or "he" is to be understood as the pronoun of the auxiliary of **ἐψοτῶα** in 25:15) purifies him, consumes his *hulic* nature in the same way fire consumes. The tense of **ἡαῶκ** "will complete" (25:9) is future. Two other future forms follow, i.e. **ἡαῶι ἡαῶι**, "he will receive himself" (25:12), and **ἐψἡαῶτῃ**, "he will be purified [i.e. out of diversity into Oneness]," 25:13. The summary statement in 25:19-20, however, uses the perfect tense, "These things have happened to us." The problem of tense is probably due to the fact that the author sees the Divine purpose pointed in two directions. It points to the community of Truth, i.e. "us" (25:21), and to the cosmic universe, i.e. "the All" (25:22) or "the house" (25:23). What the Father "will do" he *has* in fact *already done*—not for the universe but for his chosen ones. The "house" is yet to become holy and quiet for Oneness (25:23-25).

The destiny for the community of Truth is, in a definite sense, realized; for the cosmos, it is unrealized. The text of 25:19-25 is significant in that it yields three of the few occurrences in

Ev. Ver. of the pronoun of the first person plural—as suffix in $\overline{\alpha\mu\alpha\eta}$ (25:20) and $\alpha\pi\alpha\eta$ (25:21), and as auxiliary prefix in $\eta\tau\overline{\eta}\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ (25:22). The writer identifies himself with a distinct group. The “missionary witness” which his group bears to the world is a witness of meditation. According to Irenaeus’ description of the Valentinian hierarchy, *Nous* and *Monogenes* alone know the invisible and incomprehensible Father and “meditate” on the way in which they may communicate his nature to the rest of the Aeons.¹ In *Ev. Ver.* 25:19-25, *mutatis-mutandis*, it is possible that the community of Truth, having experienced the Father’s gnosis and Oneness, “meditates on the All,” i.e. considers how it will be able to communicate the Father’s gnosis to the world so that the world (= the house) may become holy and quiet for Oneness (25:23-25). The word $\alpha\pi\tau\eta\rho\overline{\eta}$, in this context, has usually been taken adverbially.² But the construction $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon \alpha-$ commonly means “to meditate upon” (cf., e.g. Matt. 24:44^{sa}; Hebr. 4:1^{bo}; Hos. 7:15^{sa}; 1 Cor. 4:1^{bo}; Job 1:5^{sa}; Prov. 17:12^{sa}).³

Summary and Comparison

Two comings of Christ are stressed in Justin’s writings. His prophecy-fulfillment emphasis relative to the first and second comings constitutes a major emphasis of his works. He shows thereby, on the one hand, his keen awareness of what God has done down through the ages, and, on the other hand, of what he will yet perform (= Divine teleology). Justin’s emphasis, however, tends to slight the work of God in behalf of the Christian community in between the two advents. According to I. 32:4, in interpreting Gen. 49:10, “He shall be the expectation of the nations,” Justin thinks that the text means that men out of all nations will be awaiting expectantly him who is to come again ($\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\nu$). The adverb, $\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\nu$, is unusual. What it signifies is that to Justin, events of decisive import belong either to the past or to the future. In the past, or at the first *parousia*, the important events are the various stages in the life and ministry of Jesus and the formation of the church, the new Israel. In the future, or at the second *parousia*, the important events as noted above, concern the resurrection of believers, the final judgment and

¹ *Adv. H.*, I, 2:1.

² Cf. the translations in the *Ev. Ver.* text, pp. 21, 71, 97.

³ References from Crum, *op. cit.*, p. 199b.

Christ's reign. As Goodenough has emphasized, the importance of the second *parousia*, for Justin, lies in the fact that Christians are finally saved at that time.¹ To be sure, in both of the comings, Justin finds that the power of God accomplishes his will and purpose. As witness thereto, both the Apologies and the Dialogue reveal the significant prominence of the word *δύναμις* and its congeners. With respect to the first coming, each event, according to Justin, pulsates with the power of God. Christ's coming was in accord with the power given to him by the almighty Father (D. 139:4). Christ is the first power after God the Father (I. 32:10); his pre-incarnate appearances were with the power of God (D. 128:1); his blood was not of human seed but of the power of God (I. 32:11; D. 54:2); the power of God coming upon the virgin caused her to conceive without intercourse (I. 33:4; 46:5; D. 100:5), so that at his birth, he was not only in possession of power (D. 88:2) but took "the power of Damascus and the spoils of Samaria" (Isa. 8:4) at the time the Magi came to worship (D. 77:3-4; 78:9). The seven-fold power of the Spirit prophesied in Isa. 11:1-3, found rest or the accomplishment of the Divine purpose in him (D. 87:2-3). His works were evidence of God's power (I. 30:1); so also was the Word which he spoke (I. 14:4). Thus, when Jesus returned no answer and was silent before Pilate, the writer says that it was as though the waters of a plentiful and powerful spring had been dammed up (D. 102:5). Among the events of power connected with Christ's first coming, Justin particularly singles out the cross, the resurrection, and the ascension. The hidden power of God was in the crucified Christ (D. 49:8; cf. I. 35:2). In I. 55:2, Justin claims that the cross represents the greatest symbol of God's power and rule, and then he proceeds to find the symbol in the ship's sail, the farmer's plow, the miner's tools, the human face, the Roman insignia, and in the images of the deceased emperors (I. 55). The resurrection (D. 138:1) and the ascension were likewise events of power. Justin frequently employs Psalm 24 to show the power of Christ at his ascension. He is the *κύριος κραταιὸς καὶ κύριος δυνατός* (I. 51:7) and *κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων* (D. 36:4), whose ascension cannot be hindered (cf. D. 36:3-6; 85:1-5; 127:5).

With regard to the apostolic witness and the formation of the church, Justin likewise is convinced of the operation of God's power.

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 250-252.

One of his favorite Old Testament references is Psalm 110:1-3 (LXX, 109:1-3). "The rod of his power" (Psa. 110:2) is nothing less than the mighty word of Jesus which the apostles carried forth from Jerusalem to the nations (I. 45:5; D. 83:2-4). That is, the word is the law that went forth from Jerusalem (Isa. 2:3) through the mission of the twelve, who "by the power of God," proclaimed his message to every race of men (I. 39:1-3).

The second *parousia* is also the work of God's power, according to Justin. In a first class conditional sentence (D. 31:1), he cites the two advents from the standpoint of the comparative power demonstrated in them. "Now, if in the plan of his suffering so great power is demonstrated . . . how much more in his glorious coming that is to occur." In addition, one should compare the Apologist's argument in I. 19 on the ability of God alone to raise dead bodies at the resurrection.

It has been stated above that Justin tends to slight the work of the Holy Spirit or the power of God that occurs in the period *between* the two advents of Christ. The Apologist, however, does cite two things of importance which, for him, bridge the period between the two comings, (1) The corporate life of the community of Christians united in the sacraments and in the weekly worship service, and (2) The virtuous daily life of individual Christians which is cast in the midst of a pagan society. In a sense, Justin links both emphases to one thing—the διδάγματα or ἐντολαί of Christ. The important place which Christ's commandments occupy in Christian life—between the two advents—appears in a significant passage in D. 116:2-3. The background of the passage is found in the vision of the cleansing of Joshua, the high priest (Zech. 3). Just as Joshua is said to be a brand "having been plucked out of fire" (Zech. 3:2, quoted in D. 116:2), so we Christians, says Justin, through the power of God that appeared in Jesus Christ at his first coming, have been "plucked out from fire"—the fire of former sins and fiery trials by which the Devil and all his cohorts try us (D. 116:2). Through the name of Jesus, Justin continues, we have been stripped of the sullied clothing of our sins (116:3). Thus, through his first coming, Christ rescues those who believe in his name and removes from them the defilement of iniquities. From the standpoint of the vision in Zech. 3:5, and from the point of view of New Testament Christianity, one would expect Justin to affirm that new garments are given as the old are removed.

But Justin interprets the text uniquely. New garments, he says, are reserved for the second coming. "Jesus the Son of God will again pluck us" out of sin, for "He has promised" that he will provide us with an eternal kingdom, and he has undertaken "to clothe us with prepared garments"—"if we keep his commandments." Justin's meaning is definite. Jesus *has* rescued Christians from sins, stripped them of their old garments. He *will* one day *clothe* them with prepared garments *on condition that* (ἐάν) Christians keep his commandments until he come. The passage shows a strong moralistic element but fails to emphasize the work of the Holy Spirit. The thoughtful Gnostic of Justin's day would have sensed a lack in Justin's writings at this point. The work of God in the past and future are not solidly joined together through the Divine power of the Holy Spirit in the present. It is this lack that *Ev. Ver.* apparently tries to fill. In making the attempt, the gnostic document comes closer than Justin to the New Testament emphasis. At the same time it must be remembered that, in *Ev. Ver.*, the life of the community in the past is indistinct and that any future *eschaton* for the community is practically non-existent. Or, one can say that in *Ev. Ver.*, the past and the future coalesce into the present. The thing that matters is the present experience of the Father's gnosis through the Logos, a gnosis interpreted by the Holy Spirit. And it must be remembered that, while Justin's experiential emphasis is weak, the life of the community always appears in his writings in a simple and clear form, always anchored to the work which God has done for men in history.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE NATURE OF TRUTH IN *EVANGELIUM VERITATIS* AND IN THE WRITINGS OF JUSTIN MARTYR VIEWED IN THE LIGHT OF THE BIBLE AND EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

I. THE IDEA OF TRUTH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT AND IN THE INTERTESTAMENTAL PERIOD

A. *The Theology of the Old Testament today*

Prior to an investigation of the Hebrew words for truth, the question must be asked: How do modern scholars understand the nature of truth in the Old Testament? The answer is not easy in view of markedly dissimilar approaches. A brief attempt must be made, therefore, to understand these approaches.¹

On the one hand, a number of modern works resort to a systematic treatment of Old Testament theology. L. Köhler,² for example, adopts a simple three-fold approach which is subject-oriented—God, man, and redemption. To be sure, Köhler develops some important ideas. Essentially, however, he merely attempts to reflect what each part of the Old Testament canon says on theology, anthropology, and soteriology. His method, therefore, differs little from the method of standard Old Testament theologies of the 19th century.³ Other theologians in the mid-twentieth century, e.g.,

¹ Many works on Old Testament theology have been produced in the 20th century. In what follows, the aim is not to be exhaustive but suggestive. Nine representative works are considered briefly.

² *Old Testament Theology*, trans. A. S. Todd (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1953, trans. from 3rd revised ed.).

³ E.g., A. B. Davidson, *The Theology of the Old Testament* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907) which shows the same three divisions plus a final section on eschatology (chapters XI-XII—"The Doctrine of the Last Things"). Köhler gives only minor attention to eschatology in his final chapter, "Salvation by Redemption" (*op. cit.*, pp. 227-238).

P. van Imschoot,¹ E. Jacob,² and Th. C. Vriezen³ stress—each in his own way—a topical or systematic treatment of Old Testament theology.

On the other hand, however, several scholars (notably Procksch, Eichrodt, and von Rad) show a basic dissatisfaction with a topical approach. The work of Otto Procksch⁴ views all theology as Christology. Christ, he says, is the midpoint of theology as well as the origin and goal of all history in which theology occurs. In the history and faith of Israel, he continues, one finds a pre-Christian world of the spirit which reaches its goal in Jesus Christ. Therefore, Jesus brings to completion the work of Moses and the prophets. Moreover, Procksch adds, the God of the Old Testament is identical with the God of Christ and Christ's relationship to ancient Israel finds its counterpart in his relationship to the Israel of the New Covenant.⁵ Procksch divides his treatment into two main parts—the world of history and the world of ideas, i.e. history and theology respectively. His theological section (Part B) treats in succession: (I)-God and the world (including sections on revelation and creation), (II)-God and people (with sections on election, cultic forms, the law and righteousness, and the Messianic hope), and (III)-God and man. Procksch's insight into the concepts of truth and faith will be considered later (i.e. section C).

¹ *Theology of the Old Testament I*, trans. from the 1954 ed. by K. Sullivan, R. S., C. J. and F. Buck, S. J. (New York: Desclee Company 1965). Volume I is the first part of a projected three-volume work to treat in order: God, man, and redemption.

² *Theology of the Old Testament*, trans. A. W. Heathcote, Philip J. Alecock (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1958). Jacob finds the three dominant themes of the Old Testament to be God's *presence*, his *action* (man is treated in this second section), and his *final triumph* (i.e. redemption and eschatology).

³ *An Outline of Old Testament Theology*, trans. S. Neuijen (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958). The second part of Vriezen's work unfolds the three themes—God, man, and the relationship between the two (i.e. redemption and ethics), with a closing section on God's rule in Old Testament times and beyond. The unique aspect of Vriezen's work is his first part where he assesses the problems which face the scholar who wrestles with the meaning and the abiding value of the Old Testament. A similar format to the above works is followed by J. Barton Payne, *The Theology of the Older Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publ. House, 1962), who, like Vriezen, has introductory chapters on the history and nature of Old Testament theology, but from an entirely different perspective than Vriezen.

⁴ *Theologie des Alten Testaments* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1950).

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 1-19.

More recently, the theological classics of W. Eichrodt¹ and G. von Rad² have appeared. Eichrodt finds one central theme in the Old Testament—the Divine covenant. He sees the theme not as a doctrinal concept but as a ready symbol of the living process by which God reveals himself in the history of Israel.³ That is to say, history and theology operate side by side, the one complementing the other.⁴ On the scene of history at Mount Sinai, God disclosed himself, i.e. he broke in upon the life of his people and established—in fact—a covenant with them through Moses.⁵ The entire historical process in the social life and practice of a nation emerged out of a concept—unique to Israel—that God in covenantal love related himself purposefully to a people whom he had freed from bondage in Egypt.⁶ Basically, Eichrodt affirms that the revelation of God is *the* subject of the Old Testament, i.e. God of the people (Israel), God of the world, and God of the individual.⁷

With the appearance of G. von Rad's work, the problem of methodology in Old Testament theology has become acute. To von Rad, the witness of the Old Testament is essentially not historical but *kerygmatic*. The Old Testament is said to contain successive confessions of faith made by Israel. Each new generation of the nation faces the issue of self-understanding.⁸ As Israel thinks about herself, says von Rad, new material is added to the older traditions, often interpreting them and/or correcting them. The unifying factor is said to be Israel's conviction that she is God's people, always treated as a unit, always acting as a unit.⁹ Within this unity, however, are found various ideas of the progress of the history of salvation.¹⁰ With the prophets, says von Rad, the announcement comes that God's saving history is at an end. If salvation were to come to Israel afresh, it could only appear in a new saving work of God.

¹ *Theology of the Old Testament*, trans. J. A. Baker, 2 vols (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, vol. I, 1961; vol. II, 1967).

² *Old Testament Theology*, trans. D. M. G. Stalker, 2 vols (New York: Harper & Brothers, vol. I, 1962; vol. II, 1965).

³ *Op. cit.*, I, 14 and II, 10.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, I, 32.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 37.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 37 ff.

⁷ *Ibid.*, I, 33 and II, 10. Cf. the view of Procksch above to which Eichrodt acknowledges his indebtedness (Eichrodt, *op. cit.*, I, 33).

⁸ *Op. cit.*, I, 119.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 118.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 128.

Hence, in his second volume, the writer addresses himself to the issues of the prophetic message, the exile, and the new activity of God in the post-exilic period. His work concludes with an attempt to synthesize the messages of the two testaments.

Summary and evaluation. Even a brief survey of Old Testament theological thought today reveals vast areas of variance which give pause to any easy answer to our opening question: How do modern scholars understand the nature of truth in the Old Testament. Several conclusions, however, appear possible:

First, the topical approach to Old Testament theology betrays an artificial scheme. In such an approach, truth simply becomes one concept amid many others. Quite the contrary, the Old Testament is not an artificial production. It must be allowed to bear its own witness, i.e. give its own interpretation.

Second, the *kerygmatic* emphasis of von Rad suggests that truth in the Old Testament is preeminently a process. Israel continually recognizes herself as God's people, continually reshapes her tradition, and continually is "open to the future," i.e. to the actualization of God's promise which has been "monotonously reiterated."¹ Admittedly, von Rad's treatment gives a dynamic stress to the nature of Old Testament truth. The disturbing element, however, is its radical approach to historical tradition.²

Third, Eichrodt's approach (cf. also O. Procksch) suggests the possibility of a rich theological harvest with respect to the nature of truth in the Old Testament. He indicates that, on the scene of Israel's history, God reveals himself to his people and, thereby, to the world, a revelation that is channelled through a covenant and/or

¹ *Ibid.*, II, 426.

² Eichrodt (*op. cit.*, I, 512-520) thinks that von Rad's view tends to dissolve Israel's history. If a religious witness, says Eichrodt, lacks certitude in its bond with historical reality, can it claim to be a historical revelation? In response, von Rad (*op. cit.*, II, 411-413) has questioned the adequacy of Eichrodt's own view on at least two issues. Eichrodt's "covenant *schema*," says von Rad, has no common bond with royal theology. Moreover, he feels that Eichrodt presents the "relationship" idea from divergent theologies and traditions and thereby renders his entire arrangement suspect. Fundamentally, the difference between the two theologians is the difference between historical tradition (Eichrodt) and *kerygmatic* tradition (von Rad). The suggestion of von Rad (*ibid.*, 416f.) that teams of Old Testament expositors engage in a fresh discussion of scripture passages could possibly open the way to resolve the sharpness of the difference between the two theologians and between other Old Testament theologians as well.

the relationship which a covenant connotes. In revealing himself, God calls for a response. It is precisely at this point that the idea of truth in the Old Testament can emerge and make the following claim: Truth (אמת) is found in a God who reveals himself in history, who binds himself in faithfulness (אמנה) to his people through a covenant, and who elicits from his people a response (אמן) to his revelation. The question is: Will exegesis support the claim as given?

It is time now to examine in detail the Hebrew terms for truth (section B) and thus to ascertain the exegetical and theological emphases in the Old Testament which the Hebrew terms suggest (section C).

B. The Terminology for "Truth" in the Old Testament

G. Quell's treatment of the Old Testament term for ἀλήθεια, i.e. אמת,¹ states that the word is first of all a *legal* term. It suggests the idea of veracity in speech (cf. Gen. 42:16; Deut. 22:20) as well as the reality of facts (Deut. 17:4; Josh. 2:12). Quell's article also observes that אמת is a *religious* term. God is said to be rich in faithfulness and truth (Exod. 34:6), to maintain truth (Neh. 9:33), and to affirm his truth and faithfulness in relation to his promises (Gen. 32:11, Hebr., Psa. 19:9).² Two things are thereby implied: (1) The idea of truth in the Old Testament contains a specific historical meaning. It points to what has occurred or to what will occur in history, not to the necessities of nature.³ Truth is not basically that which lies behind things, something to be discovered by penetration of their inner depth, but truth is that which will be established in the future.⁴ (2) God who deals in truth with men (2 Sam. 2:6) calls for men to respond in like manner. The servant of Abraham who has received a clear and convincing proof of God's truth and faithfulness senses that His truth will continue if man responds to it in a practical way (Gen. 24:48-49).⁵ Sometimes the practical demonstration will appear

¹ TDNT, I, 232-237. The term occurs about 127 times in the Old Testament.

² *Ibid.*, 236.

³ Cf. Hans F. von Soden in an inaugural address at the University of Marburg titled, "Was ist Wahrheit? Vom geschichtlichen Begriff der Wahrheit" (Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1927), p. 14.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ Cf. A. Schlatter, *Der Glaube im Neuen Testament* (Stuttgart: Calver Verlag, 5th ed., 1963), pp. 551-561, but especially p. 558.

in what man says,¹ more frequently in what he does. On the one hand, in his life before Yahweh, man is to "walk" (הלך) in truth (1 Kings 2:4; 3:6; 2 Kings 20:3; Psalms 26:3; 86:11; Isa. 38:3). On the other hand, in his relationship with others, man is to "do" (עשה) the truth (Gen. 24:49; 47:29; Josh. 2:12, 14; Judg. 9:16, 19; Ezek. 18:8; Zech. 7:9). But, whether before God or among men, the fact remains that *'emeth* expresses man's true calling. Yet it is no isolated inner spiritual quality of man (Psa. 51:8, Hebr.) but *the* basic factor in his everyday life and relationships. Man's performance in life becomes the support and guarantee of his promise or of his *'āmēn* to the God of truth.²

Equally important for the idea of truth are the cogeners of אמת. The adverbs אמנה, אמנה, and אמנה occur some sixteen times, being found in all three divisions of the Hebrew Bible.³ In twelve of these references, the LXX translates the adverb by (a) ἀληθῶς, (b) ἐπ' ἀληθείας, or (c) ἀληθεία. The references show that the adverb emphasizes facticity or veracity. In addition, the adverb אמנה occurs almost thirty times, the translation of the LXX being ἀληθῶς (Jer. 28:6, Hebr. [35:6, LXX], ἀμὴν (1 Chron. 16:36; Neh. 5:13; 8:6, Hebr.), γένοιτο⁴ or γένοιτο γένοιτο (Num. 5:22; Deut. 27:15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26; 1 Kings 1:36; Psalms [LXX] 40:14; 71:19; 88:53; 105:48; Jer. 11:5), and, ἀληθινός (Isa. 65:16 twice).

Of far greater importance is the noun אמנה, occurring approximately 50 times. In almost half of the occurrences the LXX renders the word ἀλήθεια,⁵ twice it uses the adjective ἀληθινός.⁶

¹ For example: Esther 9:30; Psalms 15:2; Prov. 8:7; 12:19; Eccles. 12:10; Jer. 9:4 (Hebr.); 23:28; Dan. 8:26; Zech. 8:16; Mal. 2:6.

² Cf. A. Schlatter, *op. cit.*, p. 552 f.

³ Gen. 18:13; 20:12; Num. 22:37; Josh. 7:20; 1 Kings 8:27; 2 Kings 19:17; Isa. 37:18; Psalms 58:2; Job 9:2; 12:2; 19:4, 5; 34:12; 36:4; Ruth 3:12; 2 Chron. 6:18. All of the preceding references are given according to the Hebrew text.

⁴ Hans F. von Soden, *op. cit.*, p. 14 observes that the proper Greek translation of אמנה is not the adverb ἀληθῶς but the optative γένοιτο. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* I, 65 gives the correct meaning, τὸ δὲ ἀμὴν τῇ 'Εβραϊδὶ φωνῇ τὸ γένοιτο σημαίνει. That is, the "Amen" does not mean "Truly, it is so," but, "Truly, may it happen thus." More plainly, the "Amen" does not look back to a completed prayer but forward to the expected realization of the praises or petitions that are voiced in the prayer.

⁵ Psalms 36:6; 40:11; 88:12; 89:2, 3, 6, 9, 25, 34, 50; 92:3, 96:13; 98:3; 100:5; 119:30, 75, 86, 90, 138; 143:1; Isa. 11:5; 2 Chron. 19:9—all references according to the Hebrew text.

⁶ Isa. 25:1; 59:4. Elsewhere, generally, the LXX renders אמנה by ἐν πίστει, "in faith (fulness)."

The frequent parallelism of *'emunah* with *hesed*¹ lays stress on Yahweh's constancy or faithfulness to his word or promise. Furthermore, the fact that the majority of these references occur in the psalter suggests that the real nature of truth is found ultimately not in the adjudication of cases at the village gate but among worshipers in Yahweh's sanctuary who remember his covenant and praise him for his abiding faithfulness.

As for the verb אָמַן , it occurs approximately 105 times (Qal participles - 11, Niphal forms - 44, Hiphil forms - 50). The LXX uses a form of ἀλήθεια in two of the references only (Psalm 12:2; 31:24, Hebr.). The *niphal* forms² generally express the idea of firmness, trustworthiness, what is faithful or true. Thus they imply that God (Deut. 7:9; Isa. 49:7; Jer. 42:5), his decrees (Psa. 93:5, Hebr.), his word (1 Chron. 17:23; 2 Chron. 1:9; 6:17; 1 Kings 8:26), his name (1 Chron. 17:24), and his love (Isa. 55:3) are all true (or will be shown to be true) and faithful. The *hiphil* forms³ (e.g. אָמַן), on the other hand, are used regularly to describe Israel's response or lack of response to the Divine revelation, a revelation made known to the people through events or signs (e.g. Exod. 4:5, 8, 9, 31; Psa. 78:32 [Hebr.]; Isa. 28:16), or the Divine word revealed by his servants (e.g. Exod. 4:31; 14:31; 19:9; Num. 20:12; 14:11; Deut. 1:32; Psalms [Hebr.] 78:22; 106:12, 24; 119:66; Isa. 7:9; 43:10; 53:1; 2 Chron. 20:20). Or, to treat the facts historically, one finds that the *hiphil* forms often express Israel's response of "yes" or "no" to God and his word in times of crisis; in Egypt (Exod. 4:31, cf. 4:1, 5, 8, 9), at the Red Sea (Exod. 14:31; Psa. 106:12, Hebr.), at Sinai (Exod. 19:9), in the desert (Psa. 78:22, 32), at Kadesh-barnea (Num. 14:11; Deut. 1:32; 9:23-24), at Meribah (Num. 20:12), as the northern kingdom was captured (2 Kings 17:14), as Judah faced military coalitions at Tekoa (2 Chron. 20:20) and at Jerusalem (Isa. 7:9), and as the people were in exile (Isa. 43:10).

¹ Psa. 33:4-5; 36:6; 40:11-12; 88:12; 89:2-3, 25, 34, 50; 92:3; 98:3; 100:5; 119:75 f., 88-90; Lam. 3:22f.; Hos. 2:21-22—all references according to the Hebrew text.

² Translated in the LXX by a form of the adjective πιστός (29 times), by passive forms of πιστόω (9) and (ἐμ)πιστεύω (2), and by πιστις (1). Three forms of the *niphal* have an uncertain rendering in the LXX.

³ Translated in the LXX 49 times by (ἐμ)πιστεύω (once καταπιστεύω) and once by πείθω. This means, of course, that in the LXX, ἀλήθεια and its congeners and πιστεύειν with its congeners meet together in the single root 'mn.

C. *The Meaning of Truth in the Old Testament*

1. Truth means a firm and constant reality. One basic group of meanings for *'mn* is "to support, carry, hold, care for."¹ Thus, in Num. 11:12, the articular participle *מְנִי* is to be translated "the nurse," i.e. the one who supports or carries the unweaned infant. Both the *qal* passive (Lam. 4:5) and *niphal* (Isa. 60:4) forms connote those for whom others assume responsibility. The idea of firmness appears also in the *niphal* forms in Deut. 7:9 and Isa. 1:21 and frequently in the *qal* passive participial noun *'emuna*. Primarily, the Old Testament ascribes the quality of truth or firmness to God (Exod. 34:6; Deut. 32:4). In history, Yahweh has been fully certified as the trustworthy and true God who never varies in his character, one upon whom man can always depend.² In addition, when used with reference to God, the adjective "true" carries with it the idea of monotheism. The God of truth (Psa. 31:6, Hebr.) can brook no rival (Exod. 20:3; Isa. 44:6).³ The true God, however, can be known, but only as he reveals himself. In one sense, Old Testament writers find the Divine revelation in his creation. God's works, they say, declare his constancy or his faithfulness (*'emuna*, Psa. 33:4-7). As one writer faces the reality of the fickleness and deceitfulness of the human heart (Psa. 36:1-4, Engl.), he directs the reader's attention outward and upward to creation, to the greatest and most extensive parts of creation—heavens, clouds, mountains, seas—as indicative of "the greater realism,"⁴ the realism of the steadfastness (*ḥeṣed*) and faithfulness (*'emuna*) of God (Psalm 36:5-6).⁵

In a much deeper sense, however, Old Testament writers insist that the truth about God and the truth which God is, are revealed to man in historical events as well as in the Divine law or covenant. The frequent use of the title, "The God of Abraham, the God of Isaac,

¹ E. Perry, "The Meaning of *'emuna* in the Old Testament," *JBR*, XXI (October, 1953), 252.

² O. Procksch, *op. cit.*, p. 606 f.

³ Procksch, *ibid.*, points out that the adjective "true," when used of God, implies both his holiness and righteousness. Since he remains true, he will crush his untrue people.

⁴ The term comes from G. A. Smith, *Four Psalms* (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1896), pp. 60-67.

⁵ Both N. H. Snaith, *The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament* (London: Epworth Press, 1944), p. 126, and E. Perry, *op. cit.*, p. 253, call attention to the significance of the frequent union of the terms, *ḥeṣed* and *'emuna*.

and the God of Jacob" (e.g. Exod. 3:6) shows that Divine truth is communicated in history and evokes relationships.

2. Truth, then, means a relationship. God reveals his truth (*'emeth*) to man in acts of love and faithfulness (*'emuna*). At the same time, he calls on man to respond to him in trust or faith (*'āman*). The mutuality of relationship appears in a special sense in the *niphal-hiphil* forms of *'mn* (see section B above). Herein lies the inseparable connection of truth with faith. As an attitude, says Procksch, faith without truth is unthinkable.¹ Therefore, faith always stakes its claim on truth. Faith is no leap into the dark but into the bosom of the faithful and true God.² So it is that Abraham's faith (Gen. 15:6) was essentially a true appropriation of the promises of God which are faithful and true (Gen. 32:11, Hebr., 1 Chron. 17:23; 2 Chron. 1:9; 6:17). This mutuality of relationship between God and his people appears succinctly in two texts, both of which use the *hiphil-niphal* conjugations of *'mn*. According to the Chronicler (2 Chron. 20:20), Jehoshaphat the king issued a challenge to his fellow Judeans as they were facing a military crisis in the wilderness of Tekoa. "Believe [יִתְּמַנּוּ] in Yahweh your God," says the king, "and you will be made firm [יִתְּחַזְּקוּ]." A similar word-play during a similar crisis occurs in Isa. 7:9 as the prophet issued a challenge, a solemn challenge, to faithless king Ahaz and the men of Jerusalem. "If you do not believe [i.e. in God]," warns the prophet, "surely you will not be made firm." G. A. Smith has tried to express the word-play by the help of an old North-England term, "If ye have not *faith*, ye cannot have *staith*."³ The idiom *'mn b'Yahweh* means to steady oneself on Yahweh⁴ which itself suggests two other important items. First, the phrase in Isa. 7:9 suggests a relationship to the God of truth who encounters man and requires of man the greatest possible ethical activity.⁵ Faith in the true God is always heroic for it casts man on God alone against a hostile world.⁶ Faith means, then, a personal response to God in obedience

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 181.

² *Ibid.*

³ *The Book of Isaiah*, I (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1927), 104. Hans F. von Soden, *op. cit.*, p. 12, has expressed the word-play in a German translation, "Wenn ihr euch nicht an mich haltet, so könnt ihr euch nicht halten."

⁴ Cf. G. von Rad, *op. cit.*, I, 171.

⁵ Cf. O. Procksch, *op. cit.*, p. 603.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 181.

and faithfulness (*'emuna*). Perry¹ discovers that of the twenty-five Old Testament occurrences of *'emuna* which apply to man, sixteen refer to man's responsibility to God while nine refer to his speech and action in positions of trust. Thus, *'mn* together with *'emuna* and *'emeth* may have a strong ethical stress. That is, man's response to God in faith results in a new ethic, a life in which truth is centered in the soul (cf. e.g. Exod. 18:21; Josh. 24:14; 1 Sam. 12:24; 1 Kings 2:4; Jer. 7:28, and cf. pp. 181-2 on the use of *'emeth* in relation to man). A second item suggested by Isa. 7:9 is that faith is the key to the knowledge of Yahweh and his will. The prophet who bears the message to Ahaz is privy to that knowledge not because he possesses special powers of perception but because he has responded in faith to the call which he has heard (Isa. 6:8). The hearts of Ahaz and the Judeans may indeed tremble like the trees of a forest before a strong wind (Isa. 7:2), but let them cast themselves upon Yahweh and they will find not only confidence for their immediate crisis but certitude and knowledge of Yahweh's gracious plan now and in the future. The challenge to trust in God's true word may (Isa. 7:10-16) or may not (Gen. 15:6) be accompanied by signs.² In either case, the challenge asks man to cast himself upon Yahweh's promise even though the sight of man's own eyes finds the promise to be impossible (Rom. 4:19-21). And—whether or not there are accompanying signs—truth as God's promise, assuredly points to a future.

3. Truth, therefore, is a Divine power that anticipates a future fulfillment. Quite apart from any distinct Divine element, one finds occasionally the anticipatory aspect of truth in everyday situations of Old Testament life. Joseph, for example, intends to discover in the future whether the truth is with his brothers or not (Gen. 42:16). Rahab requests the two spies to give her a token of truth (Josh. 2:12) and, in response, the spies assure her that they will act toward her in truth (Josh. 2:14). A true

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 255.

² Procksch, *op. cit.*, p. 607, contrasts the trust of an Abraham torn away from his natural associations (Gen. 12:1-3; 20:13) and thrust on God alone apart from any supporting sign (Gen. 15:6) with the trust of a slave people who believe as they witness the signs wrought through Moses (Exod. 4:30-31). The situations, however, are different. The position of the enslaved people in Egypt who witnessed signs vindicating God's work is comparable not to the position of Abraham but to that of the slaves to whom Jesus came (Luke 4:18-19) with authenticating signs (Matt. 11:4-6).

seed or vine is one that will produce fruit (Jer. 2:21; cf. John 15:1). Much more frequently, however, one reads concerning the anticipation of *God's* truth. For example, almost a third of the references to *'emeth* alone occur in the context of worship where the writer asks for and anticipates, either a continued manifestation of God's truth (e.g. Psa. 40:11; 117:2; 146:6, all references to the Hebrew text), or a fresh revelation of it (e.g. Psa. 25:5; 43:3; 37:3; 61:8, all references to the Hebr. text).

In a special way, however, Old Testament writers anticipate the coming display of God's truth or faithfulness in the fulfillment of His promises. Thus, in Psa. 132:11, the faithful oath to the effect that an heir will one day sit on David's throne, is nothing less than God's *'emeth*. The Divine power in his *'emeth* will bring the promise into fruition. Likewise in Psa. 89:15, *'emeth* together with *hesed* precede God as forerunners on his way to victory. The fulfillment of the Messianic promise in Isa. 49:7 is assured because of the "Lord who is faithful" (נֶאֱמָן). The truth of Yahweh is like a plant that grows up naturally to its destined goal.¹ Jerusalem, the faithful city (קִרְיַת הַנֶּאֱמָן), which became a prostitute (Isa. 1:21), is yet to become faithful (Isa. 1:26, cf. Zech. 8:3). When the Messiah comes, he will be clothed with faithfulness (Isa. 11:5) and faithless Israel will be betrothed to Yahweh forever in faithfulness (Hos. 2:19-20 [Hebr. 2:21-22]).

Summary

Investigation shows the idea of truth to be a most important unifying theme for Old Testament theology. The theme begins with "the God of the Amen" (Isa. 65:16), i.e. the God whose word is worthy of trust. Through Divine revelation man can know God's truth. That is, through creation (Psa. 36:5-6, Engl.), by historical acts (1 Kings 8:26), and by covenantal faithfulness (Deut. 7:9), Yahweh makes his true self known. His revelation establishes a relationship. He shows himself as faithful and true to man (cf. the *niphal* of *'mn*): he challenges man to trust (cf. the *hiphil* of *'mn*) his true and faithful word. Moreover, the "God of the Amen" (Isa. 65:16) anticipates from man a response of *'āmen* (Jer. 11:5). As man responds, two things occur: truth is implanted in his own life and he comes to know, and participates

¹ O.A. Piper, "Truth," *IDB*, IV (1962), 714a.

in, the true purpose of God which itself anticipates a future fulfillment.

Psalm 46 may be taken as an illustration of the theme of truth in the Old Testament. God is truth that stands firm as a fortress or a rock (v. 1). He is likewise the one who has related himself to his people by a true and faithful covenant for he is the God of Jacob (v. 7). Finally, God is truth like a river which moves with power toward its appointed destiny (v.4, cf. Jer. 2:13).

In brief, truth in the Old Testament is ontological, i.e. it reveals the nature of God and the way God communicates his truth to men. Truth is also eschatological, i.e. it anticipates the unfolding of God's purpose for the world. According to the New Testament, Jesus comes in fulfillment of that purpose.

D. *The Idea of Truth in the Intertestamental Period*

1. Beginning with the exile, the meaning of truth is found in the law and the life lived in accord with it.¹ This stress increases during the intertestamental period. To be sure, as in the Old Testament, truth is ascribed to God. So, for example, in the Wisdom of Solomon (ca. first century B.C.), God is said to be true (12:27; 15:1) and a true observer of the heart (1:6).² The same feature is found occasionally in the Hymn Scroll from Qumran (4:40, "Thou art truth" and 15:25, "Thou art a God of truth").³ Moreover, the Tannaim call truth "God's seal," i.e. truth bears upon it the name of its owner. Thus, one of the Tannaim understood the three letters of "truth"—אמת—as shorthand for Elohim, Melek, Tamid, i.e. "Living God and eternal King." Another unique explanation says that, since the three letters of אמת consist of the first (א), the middle (מ), and the final (ת) letters of the Hebrew alphabet, the word itself is a compact form of Isa. 44:6, "I am the first and the last."⁴

¹ Cf. D. J. Theron, *Paul's Concept of ἀλήθεια (Truth). A Comparative Study with special reference to the Septuagint, Philo, the Hermetic Literature, and Pistis Sophia* (Princeton, N. J.: Unpublished doctor's dissertation, 1950), p. 62. Cf. also J. B. Bauer, "Wahrheit" in *Bibeltheologisches Wörterbuch* (Graz: Verlag Styria, 1959), pp. 779-781.

² Compare also 3 Maccabees (ca. second century B. C.) 2:11, "Thou art faithful and true," and 6:18, "the true God."

³ See M. Mansoor, *The Thanksgiving Hymns* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1961), pp. 131, 184. The Dead Sea Scrolls are herein accepted as intertestamental literature without discussion of a precise date.

⁴ See H. L. Strack, P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*

In general, however, truth has come to be a synonym for the law.¹ To perform the truth, therefore, means to live by the law. Tobit (ca. 200 B.C.) affirms that the course of his life lies in the paths of truth (1:3) and, accordingly, he charges his son to do the truth, i.e. obey the law (4:5-6).² In the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (end of second century B.C.), one finds that truth often means the law (*Test. Asher* 5:4; 6:1; *Joseph* 1:3; *Benjamin* 10:3; *Gad* 3:1; *Reuben* 3:8) which is to be carried out.³ It is in the Scroll of the Rule⁴ (I QS) and the Thanksgiving Hymns⁵ (I QH) from Qumran, however, that truth and the law are most intimately linked together.⁶ Two expressions in particular point to the relationship; "the precepts of truth" or "the truth of thy precepts" (Rule 1:11, 15, 24-26) and "thy truth" (Hymns 4:14, 25; 6:8, 9, 10, 12; 7:14, 19-20, 26, 28; 9:9-10, 24; 10:17, 20, 29, 30; 11:26, 30; 14:20; 15:23; 16:4).

If then, God and his law are true, the sectaries or covenanters are to witness to his truth (I QS 4:6), to cling to it (I QS 1:11; I QH 16:7), to practise it (I QS 5:3), to reprove each other by it (I QS 5:25), to rejoice in it (I QH 6:25; 10:30), and to proclaim it (I QM 19:9).

2. The eschatological element to truth is also found in the intertestamental period.

(München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1965), Zweiter Band, p. 362 and G. F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, the Age of the Tannaim* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932), Vol. II, p. 194 f.

¹ In the Wisdom of Solomon, e.g. 6:17, 22, and Ecclesiasticus (second century B. C.), e.g. 4:28; 7:20, truth is sometimes equated with wisdom.

² Cf. also Tobit 3:5; 13:6

³ "Love the truth" (*Reuben* 3:9; *Dan* 2:1; 6:8), "Do the truth" (*Reuben* 6:9; *Benj.* 10:3), "Remain in the truth" (*Jos.* 1:3), and "Guard it" (*Issachar* 7:5).

⁴ References to, and translations from, The Scroll of the Rule which follow are taken from A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran*, trans. G. Vermes (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961).

⁵ References to, and translations from, The Thanksgiving Hymns which follow are taken from M. Mansoor, *op. cit.*

⁶ Cf. M. Burrows, "The Discipline Manual [= The Scroll of the Rule] of the Judaeon Covenanters" in *Oudtestamentische Studien*, VIII (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1950), p. 170 f., who lists no fewer than 20 distinct expressions embodying the word 'emeth. In the Dead Sea Scrolls published prior to 1962, the word "truth" occurs above 100 times, including nearly 42 texts in I QS, 46 texts in I QH, and 10 texts in I QM (The War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness). The extensive use of 'emeth in I QH may be ac-

The Qumran scrolls sense that the world is a battlefield where two spirits—one of truth and one of evil—vie with each other. A barrier of eternal hatred exists between the two (I QS 4:16-18).¹ Both spirits are made by God and upon them God has based all his works and service (3:25-26). Each man has a share of both spirits and lives in accord with his share—whether much or little (4:15-16).² Throughout the human tension the spirit of truth enlightens man's heart and teaches him the ways of true righteousness (4:2). His struggle, however, has an end (4:16-17). The Habakkuk commentary (7:10-13) affirms that the covenanters, the men of truth who observe the law, "do not slacken in the service of Truth when the final time delays for them; for all of the seasons of God come to pass at their appointed time according to His decree."³ Truth will indeed arise in the world (I QS 4:19) and God will purify the work of every man by his truth (4:19-20). "He will cause the Spirit of Truth to gush forth upon him [i.e. upon sons of the truth] like lustral water" (4:21).⁴

The book of First Enoch (ca. second and first centuries B.C.) also contains a clear eschatological idea of truth. In the extant portions in Greek,⁵ the word ἀλήθεια and its cogeners occur only a few times (10:16; 11:2; 21:5; 25:1; 27:3; 99:2; 104:10, 11, 12, 13; 106:12). At first glance, nothing unusual appears. The work asserts that all wrong is to be destroyed from the earth and the eschatological plant of truth is to appear (10:16). The eschatological judgment is true (27:3) and truth and peace are to reign together forever (11:2). In the final chapters, however, eschatological

counted for from the context of worship. Cf. similarly the large use of *'emeth* (also *'emuna*) in the canonical book of Psalms as noted in the previous section. See the top of p. 183.

¹ Cf. *Test. Judah* 20:1, "Two spirits wait upon man, the one of truth and the other of error." Between the two, however, lies "conscience", not hatred.

² Cf. *Test. Judah* 20:3, "The (works) of truth and the (works) of error are written on the breast of man, and each one of them [i.e. the works] the Lord makes known." The text shows an implicit determinism (γέγραπται) comparable to I QS 4:15-16.

³ A. Dupont Sommer, *op. cit.*, p. 263.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 81.

⁵ A. Greek ms from Akhmim containing 1:1-32:6 was published by A. Lods, *Le Livre D'Hénoch* (Paris: E. Leroux, ed., 1892), a tiny portion (89:42-49) appeared in R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), Vol. II, p. 254, and a ms containing the final chapters (97:6-107:3) was published by C. Bonner, "The Last Chapters of Enoch in Greek," in *Studies and Documents*, 8 (1937).

truth is seen to be deterministic. In 99:2, a woe is pronounced upon those who attempt to alter the true words thereby perverting the eternal covenant. The text implies that the truth is to be equated with an eternal covenant. Again, in the final two chapters as Noah is born, so strange are the circumstances of his birth that Lamech asks Methusaleh to go to Enoch and learn from him the truth (106:7).¹ The truth is what is already known and determined in heaven. Enoch, therefore, proceeds to present the truth. He predicts the deluge, charts the course of Noah's life including the deliverance which Noah and his three sons will effect, and then concludes, "He [i.e. the Lord] showed (these things) and revealed (them) to me and I re[ad them]² in the tablets of heaven." The meaning is clear. Truth, according to First Enoch, is eschatological but no less is it deterministic.

Summary: In the intertestamental literature, the idea of truth maintains a link with the Old Testament in several ways. Truth is ascribed to God, also to men who live according to God's norm. In his inner life, man is to love truth; before men, he is to perform it.³ Furthermore, the nature of truth is especially discovered in the context of worship.⁴ Finally, truth anticipates a goal, for God will one day purify men by his truth (I QS). According to First Enoch, the goal is determined, already inscribed in the tablets of heaven. The fact remains, however, that in the intertestamental period, the Torah itself became the primary expression of Divine truth.⁵ And, correspondingly, obedience to the Torah became the way of truth for man. Man is engaged in a continuous struggle against evil (I QS 4), and only by a life lived in truth, i.e. obedience to the law, can he be victorious. Precisely here the intertestamental literature has lost the dynamic element which truth shows in the Old Testament. The Old Testament makes it plain that the communication of truth occurs in history. Even the OT law basically witnesses to events of

¹ The Greek papyrus is damaged precisely at the place ἀλήθεια should appear. That the word should be supplied seems certain both from the presence of the word "truth" in the Ethiopic version and from the end of 106:12 where τὴν ἀλήθειαν does appear in Greek.

² The text is damaged but the restoration seems fairly certain.

³ The emphasis is much the same in Old Testament wisdom literature. Compare the use of *'emeth* and *'emuna* in the book of Proverbs.

⁴ Compare the extensive use of *'emeth* in the Thanksgiving Hymns (I QH) with a similar wide use of *'emeth* (also *'emuna*) in the book of Psalms.

⁵ Compare J. B. Bauer, *op. cit.*, p. 780.

history. Hence, as God historically reveals himself, true mutual relationships develop and mature between himself and man¹.

II. THE IDEA OF TRUTH IN THE NEW TESTAMENT²

A. *Truth is intimately linked to the coming of Jesus Christ*

O. Procksch,³ Th. Vriezen,⁴ and E. Jacob⁵ all insist that the truth revealed in Jesus Christ is what binds Old and New Testaments together in an organic and spiritual unity. In a very real sense, all New Testament writings bear testimony to this unity. The gospels witness to the life and work of Jesus of Nazareth, the book of Acts and the letters to the life and work of the risen Lord through his church, and the Revelation to the work of Jesus as the Consummator of all things. It is in John and Paul, however, that the idea of ἀλήθεια and its relation to Jesus receives a special emphasis.⁶ An important text in this respect is John 1:14. The

¹ The verb 'mn, so important in the Old Testament for an understanding of these mutual relationships, seldom occurs, for example, in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

² The main investigations into the meaning of "truth" in the New Testament have been cited by D. J. Theron (*op. cit.*, pp. 1 ff.). Theron shows that the trend of investigation has varied considerably. H. H. Wendt's treatment, "Der Gebrauch der Wörter ἀλήθεια, ἀληθής, und ἀληθινός im Neuen Testament, auf Grund der alttestamentlichen Sprachgebrauches," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken, Eine Zeitschrift für das gesamte Gebiet der Theologie*, LXV, 2 (1883), showed by its title that the meaning of ἀλήθεια and its congeners in the New Testament is to be explained on the basis of the Hebrew words אֱמֶת and אֱמֻנָה (Theron, *ibid.*, pp. 2-3). H. Cremer, *Bibisch-theologisches Wörterbuch der neutestamentlichen Graezitæt* (1915), contended, however, that secular literature was sufficient to explain the meaning of "truth" in the New Testament (cf. Theron, *ibid.*, pp. 7-8). A better balance is found in *TWNT*, I (Stuttgart: Verlag W. von Kohlhammer, 1933), articles on ἀλήθεια, ἀληθής, ἀληθινός, ἀληθεύω (233-251) by G. Quell, G. Kittel, and R. Bultmann, though as a whole, the articles support a much stronger Hebrew background than Greek. Theron (*ibid.*, p. 16, note 1) complains *in general* of the order of treatment of the word ἀλήθεια, where the Old Testament background is put first, and *in particular*, of the lack of depth to Bultmann's second article on the meaning of ἀλήθεια in Paul's writings (Theron, *ibid.*, p. 13).

³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 7-12.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 86 f.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 12.

⁶ Amid nearly 100 NT references to ἀλήθεια, 92 are found almost evenly divided in the Johannine and Pauline (including the Pastorals) literature. The adjective ἀληθής, -ές occurs 17 times in John, (including 1-3 John), 4 times in Paul, and 5 times elsewhere in the New Testament. The adjective ἀληθινός occurs 22 times in John (including 1-3 John and the Revelation), 4 times in Paul, and 5 times elsewhere, while the verb ἀληθεύω occurs only twice, both times in Paul (Gal. 4:16; Eph. 4:15).

verse points to the significant features of ἀλήθεια which appear in many places in the Johannine and Pauline writings.

First, according to John 1:14, truth finds its standard or norm in God alone. That is, the truth which comes from God is found in the Logos who is God (cf. John 1:1, 18). The truth of God or the fact that God is true has already been presented in the Old Testament¹ and intertestamental literature. In the New Testament, truth continues to connote that which accords with the Divine nature (cf. Matt. 22:16; John 3:33; 4:23-24; 8:26; Rom. 1:25²; 3:4).

Second, John 1:14 affirms that truth enters the world, becoming incarnate, or "tenting among us" (ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν), in Jesus, in whom the glory of God was visibly manifest.³ The tent in the desert was once full of Divine glory manifest visibly to the fathers,⁴ but now, says John, that glory is visibly manifest in the incarnate Jesus.

Third, John 1:14 suggests that truth enters the world in fulfillment of the Divine promise. That is, "mercy and truth," the harbingers of God's ultimate victory in the world (Psalm 89:14), find him whom they heralded in the incarnate Jesus, the one full (πλήρης) of grace and truth. The eschatological feature of the word "truth" appears here but with a new dimension. On the one hand, Jesus comes in fulfillment of God's true prophetic word. But, on the other hand, he not only discloses who God is but also challenges men to believe in his Son who is full of truth. That is, he not only speaks the truth (John 8:40)⁵ and does it (John 3:21, by implication, Jesus is meant as well as men), but *he himself is the Truth* (cf. John 14:6; 6:55; 15:1; Eph. 4:21; cf. also the ὁ Ἀμὴν of Rev. 3:14). As the Truth, he invites men to believe in him. Therefore, in the prologue of John, the Baptist bears witness concerning him (John 1:15). This means that, for John (and Paul), the complement to "truth" is "faith."⁶ As in the Old

¹ Cf. here E. Hoskyns and N. Davey, *The Riddle of the New Testament* (London: Faber and Faber Limited, 3rd ed., 1947), p. 28 f.

² The phrase ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ θεοῦ means "the true nature of God."

³ Cf. C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St John* (London: S.P.C.K., 1960), p. 138.

⁴ δόξης κυρίου ἐπλήσθη ἡ σκηνή (LXX of Exod. 40:35).

⁵ Cf. also the Hebraism in the frequent use which Jesus makes of ἀμὴν (the Synoptics) or ἀμὴν ἀμὴν (John).

⁶ There are over 50 references to πιστεύειν in Paul (including the Pastorals) and over 100 references to πιστεύειν in the Fourth Gospel alone.

Testament, faith staked its claim on truth, so now faith stakes its claim on Jesus. The fact that Jesus promises the coming of the Spirit of truth (John 15:26; 16:13) shows further that his coming was not only the true fulfillment of prophecy, but also opened the path to the goal of the complete establishment of Divine truth in the world.

Fourth, truth—according to John 1:14—points to the meaningful life which Jesus lived in the flesh. Paul implies that the entire *life* of Jesus including his death and resurrection connotes truth.¹ Jesus claims to have spoken the truth (John 8:14, 46; 18:37) and to have witnessed to the truth through his works (John 5:31, 33, 36). The genuineness of his witness is accompanied by a challenge to his enemies to enlighten him and convince him of any wrongdoing in which he has been involved (John 8:46). If then the entire life of Jesus may be summarized by the phrase, "truth was in Jesus," it is not at all surprising to find that the *kerygma* or gospel of Jesus was called truth or described as true (2 Cor. 4:2; 6:7; 7:14; 11:10; Gal. 2:5, 14; 5:7; Eph. 1:13; Col. 1:5; 2 Thess. 2:10; 1 John 2:21; 2 John 1). According to John 8:32, the power that liberates men from the fetters of sin is "the truth" and the truth is none other than the Son himself (John 8:36).² His life and history, then, are true. Moreover, he lives not for himself but for others, to invite others to participate in his true life (John 15:1-7; contrast Isa. 5:1-7). It is through him, through the truth of his gospel, that men become sons of God. They find that his flesh is true food and his blood true drink (John 6:55). They not only *know* the True one but they are actually *in* the True one (1 John 5:20). It is precisely in this light that we understand how men are "of the truth" (ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας—John 18:37; 1 John 2:21; 3:19) and how they are "to do the truth" (ποιεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν—John 3:21; 1 John 1:6; 3:18; cf. 2 Cor. 13:8; Eph. 5:9; 6:14) and "walk according to truth" (2 John 4; 3 John 3-4; cf. Gal. 2:14), as well as "speak the truth" (John 8:40, 45, 46; 16:7; 18:37; Rom. 9:1; 2 Cor. 7:14; 12:6; Eph. 4:25). Basically, up to this point, the New Testament idea of truth is seen to be Hebraic (Old Testament)

¹ Eph. 4:21, "Even as truth is in Jesus." Hoskyns and Davey, *op. cit.*, p. 30 have given a clear exegesis of the Ephesian reference.

² The Jews of Jesus' day understood that the one who makes himself a slave in this world for the sake of the Torah will become free in the world to come. Cf. H. L. Strack, P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament* II, 523. Clearly, the power of the truth announced by Jesus was amazingly new.

in background though it contains a surprising new element in its New Testament fulfillment.

B. The Idea of Truth is related to the philosophical background of the New Testament

Along with the Hebraic idea of truth, both John and Paul show a cognitive element which was prevalent in the Greek philosophical world. To be sure, New Testament writers (John and Paul, in particular) are not concerned with intuitive truth or with mere consistency of statements, e.g. reality, and correspondence with reality. Yet, John, for example, shares certain tendencies with Hellenism in that he sees God's truth in opposition to a world which is under the Devil and thus lacks truth.¹ At the same time, John differs markedly from Hellenism in his description of God as the Savior of the world.² Truth, then, is not intuitive but God's revelation and work in the world.

Both Paul and John share with Hellenism two other main ideas, i.e. (1) Truth is an unveiled reality, and (2) Truth is a process. Not only the etymology of ἀλήθεια,³ but also the use of the word in Hellenism shows the meaning of truth to be unveiled reality. Thus, as Theron points out,⁴ in the area of logic, truth meant the correspondence of report with fact, or of idea with reality. At the same time, as the dialogues of Plato so often show, truth was a process in which, through the dialectical method, the νοῦς, the ὁρεξις, and the αἰσθησις, were all challenged to contemplate, search and study, and thus finally appropriate, the truth or the true. In a sense, both Paul and John agree with these ideas. Truth to them was an unveiled reality (cf. "the manifestation of truth," 2 Cor. 4:2 with John 1:14, 17) and truth was a process. John

¹ Cf. O. A. Piper, "Truth," *IDB*, IV, 716a.

² *Ibid.*

³ The word ἀλήθεια is probably an alpha privative noun from the verb λανθάνειν, "to escape notice, be unseen, unknown." Cf. H. Cremer, *op. cit.*, p. 110. Thus the derived noun λήθη "forgetfulness" underlies the theory of ἀνάμνησις, "remembrance, recovery," i.e. of antecedent knowledge or truth, expounded in Plato's *Meno* (81-86). The word ἀλήθεια thus means essentially "that which is not unseen or veiled," or "that which is uncovered." H. Frisk *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag, 1960), p. 71 mentions several cogeners of ἀλήθεια, e.g. ἀληθίζω having the technical sense, "to color with (true) purple," ἀληθινός meaning "red" (later Greek), ἀλήθευσις "truthfulness," and ἀληθεύτης, "the one who always speaks the truth."

⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. 29-30.

indicates this process by giving the promise of the Spirit of truth who will guide the disciples into all truth (John 16:13) while Paul indicates the process by an unusual phrase, ὁρθοδοεῖν πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, "to progress toward the truth of the gospel"¹ (Gal. 2:14). The agreement of Paul and John with Hellenism, however, is seriously qualified. The Platonic idea of truth (= correspondence of idea and reality) was purely theoretical. It concerned itself with the full realization of the mental life of man. Truth centered in man. In one sense, the same idea holds sway in the New Testament, but not without an important distinction. The Biblical writers are occupied not with the mental life but with the *soma*, the whole person,² a person re-created in Christ to reach the full destiny which God has in view. Platonic theory held that truth never really entered the world in a concrete form; it claimed only that the world contains pointers to the truth (i.e. to the truth found in the world of ideas). The Pauline and Johannine idea of truth is pre-eminently personal. Both writers affirm that man as he is, is not true. Man is not at all in accord with the image for which he was made. Truth, to these writers, denotes a restoring, re-creating, power that is particularly to be found in Jesus (Eph. 4:21; cf. John 14:6) who became incarnate among men. Thus, God's redemptive plan which focuses on the appearance of Jesus is realized in the world. To Paul, truth meant the gospel (see above on p. 194) which men encounter here and now (cf. Gal. 2:5, 14; Eph. 1:13; Col. 1:5). Whereas Plato viewed truth as the dialectical process leading from real existence to the ideal, Paul understood truth to be the historical process leading from the provisional event (God the Redeemer of his people Israel) to the final consummation (Christ the Redeemer of the world). The fact that Christ has come and the fact that the gospel has become an active power in the world assure the final victory of truth.

¹ The translation is offered by C. H. Roberts in *JTS* 40, 1939, p. 55 f. and is followed by J. G. Winter in *HTR* 34, 1941, p. 161 f. A slightly different sense is given by G. D. Kilpatrick, *NT Studien für R. Bultmann*, 1954, pp. 269-274, i.e. "they [i.e. the Jewish Christians at Antioch] were not on the right road toward the truth of the gospel." But whatever may be the true sense of Gal. 2:14, truth as a process is indicated clearly in two other Galatian passages, e.g. Gal. 2:5 and especially 5:7 where someone thwarted the *continuous* obedience (πείθεσθαι, pres. infinitive) of the Galatian Christians to the truth.

² R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, trans. K. Grobel (New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1951), pp. 192 ff.

The process, however, will continue until the "True one" (Rev. 19:11) comes again to establish fully God's true eternal rule. Truth, therefore, concerns not only the message *about* Christ but the on-going joint effort *of* Christ and his church to bring God's saving truth to men everywhere.¹

The broad lines of the nature of truth in the New Testament were admirably laid down in one of the Hulsean lectures by F. J. A. Hort.² Hort finds that, in the Synoptics where the words and deeds of Jesus are foremost, the meager use of the word "truth" indicates "the disciplinary nurture by which the power of apprehending truth is called forth,"³ while the extensive use of the word "truth" in the Fourth Gospel indicates an emphasis upon the significance of Jesus' words and deeds.⁴ Especially important for the disciples are the claim (John 14:6) and the promise (16:13) of Jesus.

As a significant illustration of Hort's emphasis, both the claim and the promise of Jesus are found to reach a climax in the resurrection chapter (John 20). The Risen one reveals his incarnate person to his own and then breathes upon them the Holy Spirit. To allegorize the incident of the two disciples at the empty tomb⁵ or to view the successive appearances as concessions to the weakness of Jesus' disciples⁶ fails to capture either the implicit claim of Jesus as the truth of the event or the function of the Spirit of truth. John 20 implies that the disciples' knowledge of Christ as the truth, deepens, for they learn that he who is risen (the tomb is empty—20:1-10: he appears to Mary outside the tomb—20:11-18) is the same as their incarnate Lord (he shows them his wounds—20:19-23: he accepts the worship of Thomas—20:24-29). Yet, in view of his ascension (20:17) and in response to his own promise (15:26), he bestows upon his disciples the Spirit of truth (20:22). By the power of the Spirit they now can preach the forgiveness of sins (20:23), i.e. proclaim the truth which their incarnate and risen Lord has made possible. This means that the disciples'

¹ O. A. Piper, "Truth," *IDB*, IV, 717a.

² "The Way The Truth The Life," *The Hulsean Lectures for 1871* (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1908), 41-94.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 50 ff.

⁵ So R. Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 13th ed., 1953), who thinks that Peter and the beloved disciple represent Jewish and Gentile Christianity respectively (p. 531).

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 539.

experience with the Risen one is unique, and yet, at the same time, preparatory.

They will continue to grow in their knowledge of the Risen one for the Spirit of truth will enable them to apply their expanding knowledge to ever-changing circumstances.¹ Jesus' prayer for his disciples (John 17) identified the word of the Father with truth (John 17:17). A similar identification is to be seen as one moves on into the Pauline writings. That is, Paul also understood truth to be wedded to the Divine word or the gospel. Moreover, the stewardship which Paul exercised, made it important for him (as his earlier letters show) to present or retain truth in accord with the spiritual capacities of those to whom he wrote.² Inevitably for those mature in Christian knowledge, through a continued devotion to the basic Christian faith, their idea of truth deepened.³ But in Paul's later letters as well as in 1-3 John, Hort detects a new form of truth arising primarily because of error within the community of Christ. "Truth could no longer be only cherished and loved and studied: it had to be jealously guarded against teaching which threatened to destroy it."⁴ Thus in the letters of Paul to church rulers and more especially, in the letters of John, the threat of danger from within elicits from both writers a stress on the foundation of truth and resistance to any movement of nominal Christians "who strove to disengage an imaginary Christ from the flesh and blood of the historical gospel."⁵ Hort believes that this very movement which John faced convinced the apostle that the time was ripe for a presentation of the gospel as a declaration of truth which earlier the church had not needed.⁶ Thus, John wrote his gospel of Jesus Christ, the Truth. Hort's treatment of truth in the Fourth Gospel, however, failed to proceed beyond an anti-docetic emphasis. Yet, in Jesus' controversy with the Jews, according to John 8, ἡ ἀλήθεια is opposed not to docetism, but to τὸ ψεῦδος. The archenemy of truth is the Devil who, by occupation, is ψεύστης, and thus the father of τὸ ψεῦδος (John 8:44). The lie which he speaks contrasts sharply with the truth which Jesus speaks (John 8:45, cf. 1 John 2:21). The Greek monistic

¹ Hort, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*, p. 67.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 68.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 70.

philosophy stated that the $\psi\epsilon\upsilon\delta\omicron\varsigma$ was inert. It was itself the truth which man had yet to attain. The $\psi\epsilon\upsilon\delta\omicron\varsigma$, according to John, is an active power that seeks to lead men away from the truth. Hort's lecture likewise failed to consider John's Apocalypse, the final book of the New Testament. There the adjective $\alpha\lambda\eta\theta\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$ plays an important role,¹ by stressing both ontology and eschatology in relation to truth. For the word "true" in Revelation, signifies, on the one hand, the nature of God (6:10) or of Christ (3:7, 14; 19:11), and, on the other hand, the nature of God's decreed ways with men (15:3; 16:7; 19:2) or of his words which announce those ways (19:9; 21:5; 22:6).

Summary. In the New Testament, the idea of truth has both Hebraic and Hellenistic ties. With respect to the Hebraic element, New Testament and Old Testament alike declare that Divine truth enters the scene of history. The historical bond between the two testaments is the incarnation. The entire life of Jesus is "truth" (Eph. 4:21; John 14:6)—words, works, and redemptive suffering. He is the pattern of New Testament truth, incarnate truth, for he is the Word full of grace and truth who "became flesh" (John 1:14). To men, the pattern simply says, (1) that through faith, they are "of the truth" or "in the True one," i.e. they share the life of Christ, and (2) that they can "do the truth" or "walk according to the truth," i.e. they can live significant lives in the world.

Both as a revelation and a process, New Testament truth has ties also with Hellenistic philosophy. It is a revelation, however, of God's redeeming work in the world, and it is a process in which the Spirit of truth—in opposition to the enemy of truth—guides men in making God's redeeming work known in the world until the True one comes again.

III. THE IDEA OF TRUTH IN THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS

The Apostolic Fathers appear on the scene of history between the years A.D. 95 and 150, i.e. between the New Testament age and the age of Justin. The idea of truth in the writings of four of these fathers (the Didache, First Clement, Ignatius and Polycarp) is carefully considered in the following pages.

¹ The adjective occurs ten times, the only congener of $\alpha\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$ to be used in Revelation. On the other hand, neither $\alpha\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$ nor any congener occurs to any significant degree in the book of Acts or in the non-Pauline epistles of the New Testament.

A. *The Didache* (A.D. 90? 120?)

An eleventh century manuscript of the *Didache* was discovered in the late 19th century. The document is a manual of primitive church order consisting of two main parts—two ways of life (D. 1-6), and corporate life within the Christian community (D. 7-16). The work is very ancient, perhaps as early as A.D. 80, certainly no later than 120.¹ In the first part of the work, the writer evidently views truth as a moral imperative, a new law incumbent upon the individual Christian. The repetition of τέκνον μου² (D. 3:1, 3, 4, 5; 4:1) as well as the use of the second person singular in verbal and pronominal forms shows the direct personal nature of the first section. In the second section, the idea of truth is to be seen in its relation to the community of believers as they participate in the sacraments (D. 7, 9, 10), as they fast, pray, and work—each at his own trade (D. 8, 11, 12, 13), as they celebrate the Lord's day (D. 14), as they select their leaders (D. 15), and as they await expectantly the parousia (D. 16). By his use of the second person singular in part one and the second person plural³ in part two, the writer has shown a concern both for the individual Christian and for the corporate life of the Christian community.⁴

This means that, on the one hand, the *Didache*—in a number of places—continues the New Testament idea of truth. Truth connotes soteriology, the revelation of God's life and knowledge as mediated through Jesus, the one entitled God's παῖς (D. 9:2, 3; 10:2, 3). The same descriptive title, παῖς, is ascribed to Jesus

¹ H. Lilje, *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel* (Hamburg: Im Furche-Verlag, 1955), p. 15. J.-P. Audet, *La Didachè Instructions des Apôtres* (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1958) emphasizes the close tie which he feels exists between the *Didache* and the gospel of Matthew and thus favors a date no earlier than A. D. 90 (pp. 187-210, 212). In a similar way earlier, B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels, a Study of Origins* (New York: Macmillan & Co., 1925) argued that the *Didaché* is no later than 100 and that it is related to the gospel of Matthew "as the preacher to his text" (p. 511).

² Compare the same type of address in the book of Proverbs and in gnostic literature from Babylonia and Egypt.

³ Compare, e.g., the second personal plural imperatives βαπτίσατε (7:1), νηστεύσατε (8:1), εὐχαριστήσατε (9:1; 10:1), κλάσατε (14:1), χειροτονήσατε (15:1), and γρηγορεῖτε (16:1).

⁴ It is possible, of course, that D. 1-6 is of Jewish or Jewish-Christian origin and was joined to the second part (D. 7-16) by a redactor. At any rate, a definite link between the two parts is made in 7:1. That is, the ταῦτα πάντα προειπόντες must refer back to D. 1-6 which the writer (or redactor) understands as mandatory pre-baptismal instruction.

according to the primitive apostolic preaching (Acts 3:13, 26, compare also Acts 4:27) and probably contains a latent reference to the suffering servant passages of Isaiah 42, 49, 50, and 52:13-53:12.¹ Furthermore, it is through the *παῖς* of God that the eucharistic feast can be celebrated in which the oneness of the church is realized (D. 9:4). Possibly an even stronger soteriological note is sounded in the final chapter with its eschatological stress. Those who have endured in their faith, says the writer, will be saved "by the cursed one himself" (D. 16:5).²

On the other hand, the *Didache* shows a significant departure from the New Testament. Truth, in the *Didache*, means obedience to moral injunctions and the discernment of right and wrong. The Holy Spirit—so important for the New Testament concept of truth—plays only a minor role in Christian teaching, according to the *Didache*. Apart from the mention of the Spirit in the trinitarian baptismal formula, the writer of the *Didache* reveals little or no idea of the Spirit's relation to the new life of the Christian community.

B. *Clement* (ca. A.D. 95)

This early letter from the church at Rome advises the church at Corinth on the critical situation facing it. Younger men of the Corinthian congregation had established themselves as leaders in the church by expelling the older recognized leaders. In addressing the problem the writer sees the world as one in which truth and error co-exist side by side. Truth, however, is for him to be found in books—especially the books of the Old Testament. The church at Corinth, says the writer, will do well to give heed to the Scriptures. In 31:2, the writer says, in effect, "You ought to do the truth because it is to be found in the Old Testament." Thus, for the writer, truth is moralistic. On the whole, he bases his appeal to the Corinthian church on the exemplary lives of men of old—Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Lot (*sic!*), Isaac, Jacob, and others. In 45:2, the writer appeals to "the true Scriptures" in which

¹ Compare the LXX of Isa. 52:13, 'Ἰδοὺ συνήσει ὁ παῖς μου. Audet (*op. cit.*, p. 189) observes that the passages in the book of Acts as well as in the *Didache* refer successively to David and to Jesus, each as the *παῖς* of Yahweh.

² The expression is ὅπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ καταθέματος. The Bauer lexicon gives the translation noted above and adds the notation, "by Christ who, in the minds of those offended by him, is accursed" (p. 411b). The reference may be compared to Gal. 3:13 where Christ is said to become a curse (*κατάρα*) "for us."

one finds that holy men never expelled just men. Truth is the standard of the Old Testament by which all conduct can be measured. Elsewhere, the writer affirms that God is true (43:6), and that truth is a path to be followed in order to obtain the promised gifts of God (35:5). Near the close of his letter (60:2), the writer's prayers contain a significant clause reminiscent of John 17:17, i.e. "Cleanse us with the cleansing of thy truth." In this one reference at least, the writer goes beyond the idea of truth as a norm of conduct and sees that truth is a power for life.

C. The Letters of Ignatius (ca. A.D. 110)

Graydon F. Snyder has recently demonstrated that the Christianity of the New Testament continues on into the life of Ignatius, bishop of Antioch. The continuity, says Snyder, is especially apparent in the life and worship of the church and in Ignatius' awareness of his own call and dependence on the apostle Paul for an understanding of Christian witness.¹ In another sense, the letters of Ignatius, written as he is en route to his martyrdom at Rome, carry on the theological battle of the apostle John. This battle was waged on two fronts; against Judaeizers (cf. IMg 8-10 and IPhld. 6-9 with Rev. 2:9; 3:9), and against docetists (cf. IEph 7-9, 18; IMg 11; ITr 6-11; ISm 1-6; IPol 3 with 1-3 John).

In a remarkable passage in ISm 5, Ignatius apparently designates Judaeizers by his use of the phrase "attorneys" (συνήγοροι) of death rather than of truth. As the sentence continues, he indicates that these attorneys have refused to admit the evidence of four avenues of truth—the prophecies, the law of Moses, the gospel itself, and the sufferings and martyrdom of Christians including his own.

In IPhld 8, although the word "truth" does not occur, it is the point at issue as Ignatius reproduces the gist of his polemical conversation with Judaeizers. He insists not only that (the truth of) the gospel lies (γέγραπται) in the ἀρχεῖα, "the original documents," i.e. the Old Testament, but that he, Ignatius, possesses the sacred original documents (τὰ ἄθικτα ἀρχεῖα), i.e. the cross, death, and resurrection of Jesus, and faith through him. The importance of the text lies in the juxtaposition of the Old Testament not with the written gospel but with the Christ of the living tradition.

¹ *The Continuity of Early Christianity, A Study of Ignatius in Relation to Paul* (Princeton, N. J.: Doctor's dissertation, 1961), pp. 252-255.

Truth, for Ignatius, lies in the fulfillment of God's prophetic word in Jesus Christ, truth that provided him with an adequate answer to the Judaeizers. Christ the better High Priest has come, he says (IPhld 9:1-2). Christ is the door through which patriarchs, prophets, and apostles enter. The gospel contains the *parousia* of the Savior toward whom the beloved prophets directed their proclamation (κατήγγειλαν εἰς αὐτόν). With the birth of Jesus, the economy which has been fulfilled in God's counsels, began to take shape (IEph 19:3).

If the answer to the Judaeizers lies in truth as fulfillment in Christ of the old economy, the answer to the docetists lies in truth as indubitable fact. Truth, says Ignatius, means reality as opposed to illusion, fact as opposed to fiction. By a frequent use of the adverb ἀληθῶς, Ignatius uniquely supports his anti-docetic argument. The term is his "watchword against Docetism."¹ Christ, affirms Ignatius, not only came in fulfillment of Scriptures, but, "He was *truly* [ἀληθῶς] born, he both ate and drank, He was *truly* persecuted under Pontius Pilate, *truly* crucified and died, while those in heaven, those on earth and under the earth were beholding, who was also *truly* raised from (the) dead . . ." (ITr 9:1-2). The same adverb "truly" in a similar setting appears in ISm 1:1-2; 2:1; IMg 11:1 (compare also IEph 7:2).

On the relation of truth to Christians, Ignatius has two things to say. In the first place, he believes that Jesus Christ is the true life of Christians (ISm 4:1). According to ITr 9:2, Ignatius holds that Christ was not only truly (ἀληθῶς) raised from the dead, but that apart from him, Christians do not have the true life (τὸ ἀληθινὸν ζῆν). On the Lord's day, our life sprang up through him and through his death. How then, he asks, are we able to live apart from him? (IMg 9:1-2). Precisely at this point the soteriology of Ignatius finds its main emphasis. The life which Christ truly lived from his unique birth to his sacrificial death and resurrection is the life that Christ imparts to Christians, a life which unites them to him and to one another in an indissoluble unity (IEph 3:2; 4:2; 9:1; 11:1; 13:1; 14:1; 17:2; 20:1; IMg 1:2; 5:2; 7:1-2; 9:2; 10:1; 12:1; 13:2; ITr 2:2; 6:1; 7:1; 8:1; 9:2; 11:2; 13:2; IRo 4:3; 6:1; 7:2; 9:1; IPhld 1:1; 3:2; 4:1; 5:1; 6:2; 8:1-2; 9:1; 11:2; ISm 1:2; 3:2; 4:1, 3; 7:1; 12:2; IPol 5:1; 8:3). To be

¹ Thus J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, part II, vol. II, sect. 1, 173.

sure, Ignatius finds that the outward sign of this life will often be submission to the bishop (IEph 1:3; 4:1-2; 5:1; 6:1 and many other references). The basis, however, is the important thing for Ignatius: Jesus Christ is the true life of Christians.

In the second place, Ignatius disclaimed for himself any full appropriation of Divine truth. Truth, for him, was a process toward a goal yet unrealized. One of his favorite clauses is *ὅνα θεοῦ ἐπιτύχω*, "that I may attain to God" (IEph 12:2; IMg 14, ITr 12:2; 13:3 *et al.*), which meant nothing less than martyrdom in Rome. As he has been Theophorus ("the one bearing God")¹ in the East so he must "carry God" to the West (IRo 2:2). Ignatius shows that all Christians appropriate truth through a like life-process. They too are God-bearing ones and Christ-bearing ones (*θεοφόροι* and *χριστοφόροι*), who are themselves being carried up to the heights through the lifting-crane of Christ which is his cross. Moreover, they are his *σύνοδοι* "fellow-travelers" (IEph 9:1-2) who—like him—seek to attain unto God (IMg 1:3; ISm 9:2).

D. *The Letter of Polycarp to the Philippians* (ca. A.D. 110).²

On the basis of quotations, no writer among the Apostolic Fathers shows a greater debt to the New Testament writings than Polycarp. In bulk, Polycarp's letter is less than one-tenth the size of the works of Ignatius and First Clement combined, and yet,

¹ The name *θεοφόρος* is probably to be interpreted in an active sense. See the discussion on p. 87f. above.

² P. N. Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians* (Cambridge: University Press, 1936) has argued long and vigorously to the effect that Polycarp's letter actually contains two letters. The first letter (chap. 13 with chap. 14 as its postscript) is taken as a covering note to the copies of the letters of Ignatius which the Philippian church requested from Polycarp (Harrison, *op. cit.*, pp. 79 ff.). The second letter (chapters 1-12), "the crisis letter," is dated by Harrison about A.D. 135 and is said to be an appeal directed to the Philippians during an early stage of the Marcionite heresy (*ibid.*, pp. 172 ff.). After Polycarp's martyrdom (ca. A.D. 155), Harrison thinks that the two letters—by mistake—were united into one manuscript, and that thus they have ever appeared to the church as one letter. John Lawson, *A Theological and Historical Introduction to the Apostolic Fathers* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1961), considers Harrison's thesis but rejects it and feels that the letter is a unity to be dated ca. A.D. 107 (pp. 157 f.). Harrison's view raises as many problems as it solves. In behalf of the unity of the letter, a triad of references to martyrs who passed through Philippi (Pol. 1, 9, 13) all seem to refer to the same event. Moreover, it may be questioned whether chapter 12 constitutes a true ending for the so-called "crisis letter," and whether chapter 13 by itself, the so-called "covering note," can be styled an *ἐπιστολή* (13:2).

Polycarp's 46 "quotations" from the New Testament exceed the sum total of "quotations" in Ignatius and First Clement.¹ Polycarp's letter, however, is no mere catena of quotations but is rather a response to several needs in the Philippian church.

First, the church had written expressing a desire to obtain the letters of Ignatius which Ignatius had sent to Polycarp (chap. 13). Second, the church had requested that Polycarp write to them "concerning righteousness" (περὶ τῆς δικαιοσύνης, 3:1). Third, Polycarp is deeply concerned over an erring presbyter and his wife in the Philippian church (chap. 11). And fourth, Polycarp writes to counter docetic teaching, the influence of which had reached Philippi (chapters 7-8).

In style, the letter is hortatory² and pastoral.³ In content, the letter is evangelical, i.e. it pulsates with the new life in Christ which New Testament writings generally evidence. Truth, to Polycarp, means a life of service which finds its basis in Christ. In 5:2, he writes, πορευόμενοι κατὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ κυρίου, ὃς ἐγένετο διάκονος πάντων, "Walk according to the truth of the Lord who became servant of all." Elsewhere he observes that because Christ died for our sins, we experience his saving grace (1:2-3). As we are forgiven by him, we too must forgive (6:2). The first installment (ἀρραβών) of our righteousness is Christ who himself brought our sins to his cross (8:1). The love of the martyrs was directed not to the present age but to the one who died for them and was raised for them by God (9:2). As partners in the truth (*in veritate sociati*), Christians are to exercise the gentleness of the Lord toward one another (10:1). In brief—like his contemporary, Ignatius—Polycarp sees that truth is based on the life and work of an incarnate Christ. Hence, the one who

¹ The information is drawn from P. N. Harrison, *op. cit.*, p. 232 f.

² Compare the verb ὀφείλομεν (5:1; 6:2), the frequent hortatory subjunctive (e.g. ὀπισθώμεθα and διδάζωμεν in 4:1; γενώμεθα and δοξάζωμεν in 8:2) which, several times, is the one main verb in a sentence (compare δουλεύσωμεν in 6:3, ἐπιστρέψωμεν in 7:2, and προσκαρτερῶμεν in 8:1). In chapters 10-12, 14, which—with few exceptions—are preserved solely in a Latin version, the hortatory style is seen in numerous imperatives of the second person plural (*state* and *sequimini* in 10:1, *nolite differre* and *estote* in 10:2, *docete* in 10:3, *estote, non . . . existimetis*, and *revocate* in 11:4, *orate* in 12:3, and *estote* in chapter 14).

³ See chapter 4 and especially the address made to various groups within the Christian community—ὁμοίως διάκονοι (5:2), ὁμοίως καὶ νεώτεροι and τὰς παρθένους (5:3), and οἱ πρεσβύτεροι (6:1). Compare First Timothy 3:1, 8 and Titus 2:2-8.

denies that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is both "antichrist" and "(the) firstborn of Satan" (7:1).¹

Truth in Polycarp's letter receives an eschatological emphasis also. Jesus is to return as judge of the living and the dead (2:1). God who raised up Jesus will also raise Christians from the dead (2:2). We shall receive the coming age if we please him in the present age (5:2). We must stand before the judgment seat of Christ and give account concerning ourselves (6:2). Martyrs who have run their course have reached the place which they deserve (9:2). In one reference (11:2), Polycarp cites Paul's teaching to the effect that saints will judge the world. As the fruit of believers becomes manifest in the world, the believers will be made mature in Christ (*in illo perfecti*, 12:3).

Summary. Four writers among the Apostolic Fathers have been considered with respect to their ideas of truth. In one sense, all of their writings are faithful both to the Old Testament and to those New Testament writings which were known to them. The truth of God is centered in Jesus and in the life and worship of those who are related to him. But, in another sense, two of these writings (the Didache and First Clement) vary significantly from the Biblical witness to truth. In a legitimate anxiety over schism in the congregation (First Clement) and a concern for the regulation of the life of the church (the Didache), these works fall prey to a moralistic and legalistic approach to their problems.

Two of the fathers (Ignatius and Polycarp), however, show a remarkable grasp of Biblical truth. Polycarp's letter is brief but revealing. The wealth of his New Testament quotations and allusions show both his Christological stance and practical concern. Christians, he says, are to walk in accord with the truth of Christ who truly came in the flesh and became servant of all. Furthermore, he sees Christians as partners of the truth because of him who brought their sins to the cross (8:1). Finally, in his letter, truth receives a strong eschatological stress.

Ignatius' witness is more extensive than that found in Polycarp's letter. In brief, Ignatius affirms: Christ truly became incarnate and has become my true life, but only as I seek to attain him will I be found a true disciple. That is, for Ignatius, truth was a

¹ According to Irenaeus (*Adv. H.*, III, 3:4), the second epithet is the same that Polycarp hurled at Marcion during a personal encounter with him.

reality found in the incarnate One, and truth was a process found on the path leading to a Divinely-appointed goal. The circumstances of Ignatius' time and life possibly had a significant role to play in his particular theological position. For example, his strong support of episcopacy may, in part, reveal his concern for the orphaned church at Antioch and the dissension among its members that had just been healed.¹

However, the circumstances surrounding Ignatius were more serious than those in the local church at Antioch. First, he faced the danger of a strong docetic influence which posed a threat for the church in many places. He countered the danger with a strong incarnational theology. His dynamic exegesis of the birth of Christ (e.g. IEph 19), and of Christ's death (e.g. IEph 9) and resurrection (e.g. ISm 3), shows his deep concern with the truth pertaining to his incarnate Lord. Second, however, Ignatius faced a personal danger. From Asia to Rome, bound by a chain day and night, he travelled a rugged path at the end of which he was to find his fate among the wild beasts of the Roman arena. In this connection, truth—to Ignatius—signified indeed the path of potential discipleship. The end of that path actually meant that he could become a true disciple (μαθητῆς ἀληθῆς) of Christ (IRo 4:2). On his way to that goal, the living water spoke within him saying, "Come to the Father" (IRo 7:2).

Thus, face to face with the two-fold danger—(a) to the life of the church, and (b) to his own personal life—Ignatius, in a significant way, exhibited the Pauline and Johannine idea of truth, truth that is wedded to the gospel and truth that is obedient to the gospel through a growing understanding of him who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

IV. THE IDEA OF TRUTH IN THE WRITINGS OF JUSTIN MARTYR

Justin discerns that the central principle of truth lies in the transcendent God. He claims that after creation, God manifested

¹ B. H. Streeter, *The Primitive Church, studied with special reference to the origins of the Christian ministry* (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1929), p. 175 f, and P. N. Harrison, *op. cit.*, pp. 81-98, are probably right. The newly-acquired peace in the church of Antioch was not due to the cessation of persecution but of dissension. Streeter (*The Primitive Church*, p. 175 f.) goes one step further. The thanksgiving in which delegates from various churches are to join together in the Antioch church is, says Streeter, a thanksgiving for the accomplished election of a successor whom Ignatius approved.

himself in the world through his law, through the Logos implanted in the hearts of men, and through the work of the pre-incarnate Logos which reached its climax in the coming of Jesus Christ. Justin, therefore, is in basic agreement with the Biblical ontology and eschatology of truth.

That is to say, the God about whom Justin writes is essentially the God of the Bible. On the one hand, Justin believes that God remains the unbegotten Father (ἀγέννητος πατήρ) and Ruler (δεσπότης) of all that is, whose word through his law and prophets is faithful to his nature. On the other hand, Justin is also sensitive to the dynamic process in truth that the Bible maintains. The Logos, says Justin, who led patriarchs, inspired Jewish prophets, and enlightened Greek sages, is the Logos who became incarnate in Jesus thereby fulfilling the prophetic word. The "memoirs" of the apostles confirm the truth in the prophets. For this reason either the memoirs or the prophets are read each Sunday at the worship service of the Christian community (I. 67:3). In brief, Justin believes that truth is to be found in the unchanging God who directs the course of human history from the creation of the world to the incarnation of the Logos in Jesus Christ. Basically, such an evaluation of Justin can be maintained, yet it is not without qualification.

A. A careful investigation of Justin's prophecy-fulfillment theme shows the presence of an inert, propositional framework for truth. As noted above, Justin stresses the reality of Christ's birth through the virgin and his physical sufferings on the cross. These events, he says, are the *exact* fulfillment of the prophetic predictions. He implies that the truth concerning the birth and death of Christ was already established before the events occurred. One needs only to define what truth is over against mistaken views (e.g. the religion of the Jews or that of the Gnostics) and to challenge men to recognize (ἐπιγινώσκειν) the truth (e.g. D. 90:2; 110:6; 139:5). Justin thinks that the fulfillment in Christ is the exact replica of predictions and types. His procedure minimizes the newness of the gospel and tends to strip the dynamic element from the historical process that leads to Christ. Examples of Justin's hermeneutical method are numerous. In D. 97-106, an extended exegesis of Psalm 22 is based on the premise that the whole psalm refers to Christ (D. 99:1), in all of its minutiae of detail. Justin employs a similar method in exegeting Isa. 7

where his concern is not only with the virgin birth (Isa. 7:14) but with numerous details surrounding the birth as he finds them predicted elsewhere in the chapter (cf. e.g. D. 77-78). One of Justin's favorite passages is Gen. 49:10-11 (cf. I. 32; 54:5; D. 11:4; 52:2-4; 53:1; 54:1; 63:2; 69:2; 76:2; 120:2-5). By means of seven distinct steps he attempts to show the exact correspondence between the prophecy in the chapter and its fulfillment.

1. The Jews always had a lawgiver until Christ came, I. 32:2-3.
2. The clause, "till the things laid up for him come," originally read, "till he come for whom it is laid up" (D. 120:3-5).
3. The Gentile nations have trusted in Christ since he came, and they expect him to come again (cf. the *παλιν* in I. 32:4).
4. The foal was bound to a vine on palm Sunday as stated in the clause, "binding his foal to a vine" (I. 32:5-6).
5. The passion of Christ was predicted by means of the clause, "washing his robe in the blood of a grape" (I. 32:7).
6. Christ's origin is not from human seed but from the Divine power. The suggestion comes from the phrase, "blood of a grape" (I. 32:9-11).
7. Those who believe in Christ are predicted in the phrase "his robe," which, according to Gen. 49, Christ washed in his blood (I. 32:7-8).

The New Testament witnesses to the presence of a Messianic allusion in Gen. 49:9-11 (cf. Rev. 5:5). Justin, however, takes the step that the New Testament does not take, i.e. he claims a correspondence in exact detail between prophecy and fulfillment. The Apologist, to be sure, was both a Christian and a philosopher, and thus, he attempts to do justice to the nature of truth from both standpoints. As a Christian, he shows a deep concern for the prophetic word which found its fulfillment in the coming of Jesus Christ. He claims that Divine reality has entered this world in a historical person.

Herein he evidences his close kinship with the New Testament writers and his distance from Greek philosophers. On the other hand, as a philosopher, Justin was vitally concerned with truth which corresponds to reality and is consistent in statements. For this reason, his expression of truth shows a decided static or propositional format. Thus, in I. 46:5, there are found six aorist verb formations that express by succinct statements the various stages in the life and ministry of Jesus, from virgin birth

through ascension.¹ Justin adds that, in view of the fact that he has explained so many things from the prophets which correspond exactly to the events which have occurred, the discerning man will be able to comprehend why all these things took place as they did. Justin writes as a Christian; Christ came in fulfillment of the prophetic word. As a philosopher, however, what attracts him is that the event corresponds in precise detail to the prediction (= reality and correspondence to it). From this qualification to Justin's idea of truth another exception follows.

B. Justin alters—perhaps unconsciously—the Biblical emphasis on the communication of truth. The Old Testament perspective, for example, centers attention on the unchanging, faithful, God who makes known to his people his true nature and inviolate purpose in his law or covenant. Justin shifts the emphasis from God to man. He believes that the most true God has planted in all men his seeds of truth as well as his Logos whereby men can always choose the truth. Thereby, Justin undoubtedly shows a basic difference from the Bible. According to the Scriptures, God reveals his truth through his covenantal faithfulness (cf. Eichrodt) and challenges men to respond in faith. That is to say, God reveals himself through saving acts of history or through his prophetic word. According to Justin, God's revelation is linked to a logos-seed which God plants in man's *nous*. This qualification in Justin's idea of truth as compared to the Bible leads naturally to a third exception.

C. Justin—to a degree—fails to grasp the true purpose of the Jewish law. In the Apologies, he praises Socrates who lived by the true Logos (e.g. I. 5:3-4; II. 10:5 ff.): in the Dialogue, he disparages the Jewish law (D. 10-30). It is true that, at times, Justin speaks of the law to Trypho in terms reminiscent of the prophets (cf. e.g. D. 12 and Amos 2). Like the prophets (e.g. Isa. 1:10 ff.) he accuses the Jews of understanding the law in a purely carnal sense (D. 14:2). Moreover, in keeping with the Old Testament, he senses that the covenant of the law ordained at Sinai was provisional. That is, God himself through his prophets proclaimed the coming of a new covenant and law—even Christ—establishing thereby a new and spiritual Israel (D. 11:2-5). It was necessary (ἐδει), he says, that the Jewish rites cease (παυσάσθαι)

¹ Elsewhere, the Apologist includes the second coming as a stage.

with the coming of Christ (D. 43:1). Nevertheless, Justin's view has another side. He asserts that the law was given because of the sins of the Jews. He believes that:

1. Jewish dietary laws, ordinarily understood to have the health of the people in view, were basically given that the people might keep God before their eyes (D. 20:1).

2. The Sabbath, usually linked to the Divine rest at creation (Exod. 20:8-11; Gen. 2:1-3) was instituted because of the people's sins (D. 21:1).

3. The Jewish sacrifices, generally viewed as making a provisional atonement, were not necessary but were ordained because of the people's sins and idolatries (D. 22:1).

In short, Justin believes that the law was given because the Jews were sinners. This idea appears in a very effective contrary to fact conditional sentence in D. 18:2 (the apodosis precedes the protasis). Justin states, "For we would be keeping [impf. ἐφύλασσομεν] this circumcision, the one that is fleshly, and the sabbaths, and all the feasts absolutely, except that we have known [aorist, ἔγνωμεν] for what reason they were ordained for you, I mean [τοῦτ' ἔστιν] for your lawless conduct and hardness of heart."

In one significant passage (D. 45:3-4), Justin forthrightly divides the Jewish law into two main parts. The first part is oriented toward God containing those things that are noble (καλά) and godly (εὐσεβῆ) and righteous (δίκαια), which men do who are continually persuaded by them. The second part is oriented toward man. It contains things ordered (anarthrous, διαταχθέντα) with reference to (the) hardness of heart (πρὸς σκληροκαρδίαν) of the people, which things also those who were under the law were continually performing (ἐπραττον). Justin's language leaves no doubt that he assigns high priority to the first part of the law. The substantival adjectives which he uses as well as the present participle from πείθειν make the point clear. In contrast, the second or the "lower part" of the law consists of things ordered (no adjectives) for the hardness of the human heart. The absence of the verb πείθειν indicates that these ordinances offer no challenge to the mind or heart of man. They are simply commands to be obeyed. It should be observed that the reference to the law is set in the context of a passage on the history of salvation where the writer distinguishes between men who lived in three main

time periods: (1) Those who lived before the law, such as Noah, Enoch, and Jacob, (2) Those under the law, and (3) Those who have known fully Christ as Son of God since he has come (D. 45:4). Justin finds that there is a basic unity in all three periods. Men in all ages are saved through Christ. Those who lived under the economy of the law and were accustomed to do the things that are accepted everywhere by their nature as eternal and noble things, are well-pleasing to God. They join ranks with the righteous who preceded them in time. Both of these groups shall be saved in the resurrection along with those who have fully known Christ as Son of God.

There is little doubt that the first part of the long sentence in D. 45:4 refers to the Jewish legal economy and the patriarchs who lived before that economy. Trypho's question (D. 45:2) makes the point certain for he asks about the salvation of these two groups. Thus in D. 45:4, ἐπεὶ οἱ τὰ καθόλου καὶ φύσει καὶ αἰώνια καλὰ ἐποιοῦν εὐάρεστοί εἰσι τῷ θεῷ refer not to the Gentiles but to the righteous Jews who live under the law.¹ But significantly, the law is not mentioned. Justin affirms that the Jews who were saved in the legal economy were saved by virtue of the fact that their actions reflected those things that are noble, eternal, and universally known. Basically then, the Jewish position *does not differ* from that of the righteous men who preceded them (ὁμοίως τοῖς προγεγενομένοις αὐτῶν δικαίοις). Justin has in view quite clearly that part of the law containing what Ptolemy was later to term "pure legislation,"² that is, commandments of a moral and ethical

¹ The conclusion runs contrary to the measured opinion of commentaries, e.g., that of Otto, *op. cit.*, vol. I, part II, p. 151, note 9, apparently also the commentary of Archambault, *op. cit.*, I, 200, and definitely the commentary of A. L. Williams, *Justin Martyr, The Dialogue with Trypho* (London: S. P. C. K., 1930), p. 89, note 1, who think that D. 45:4 refers to the salvation of Gentiles. Quite apart from the fact, however, that Trypho's question (D. 45:2) concerns the Jews under the law and the patriarchs who lived before them, the more immediate context in D. 45:4, points to the same two groups. Thus, Justin says, the Jews under law, i.e. who used to do (ἐποιοῦν) the things (in Moses' law, cf. 45:3b) that are universally, naturally, and eternally, good, shall be saved along with the righteous (i.e. the patriarchs) who preceded them. The imperfect ἐποιοῦν probably indicates that the way of salvation of Jews under the law—though effective over a long period of time—has come to an end with the appearance of Christ. Now, salvation depends on a recognition of the Son of God (D. 45:4).

² *Letter to Flora*, 5:1, cf. the text of G. Quispel, *Ptolémée, Lettre à Flora* (Paris: Editions du cerf, 1949), p. 56.

nature. In essence, the patriarchs obeyed these same commandments for they show by their lives the eternal realities that exist in God and are reflected in the physical world generally everywhere. Since Justin is a Christian, he adds that the Old Testament Jews together with their predecessors, the patriarchs, are ultimately saved through Christ with those that have known Christ since he has come.

As for the second or "lower part" of the law that is oriented toward man, it embraced primarily the rites and ceremonies of the Jews, having in view the hardness of the human heart. Justin's negative view of this part of the law has already been noted. But he has also a positive view. The ceremonial rites of the law, he says, serve to show typically and symbolically what God has accomplished in Christ and in his church. Justin utilizes freely several terms in his typological exegesis, e.g. *τύπος*, *σύμβολον*, and *σημεῖον*. A few examples are the passover lamb (D. 40:1-2), the two goats on the day of atonement (D. 40:4-5), the meal offering of fine flour (D. 41:1), circumcision (D. 41:4), and the bells on the high priest's robe (D. 42:1-2). Near the close of D. 42, the Apologist affirms that there is a great deal more he could say on the subject if it were necessary. That is, in the things that were ordered by Moses (*τὰ ὑπὸ Μωυσέως διαταχθέντα*), Justin is able to enumerate types (*τύποι*) and symbols (*σύμβολα*) as well as announcements of things which are about to happen to Christ and to those who were to believe in him, and of the things which Christ himself was going to accomplish (D. 42:4). Concerning the clause *τὰ ὑπὸ Μωυσέως διαταχ.*, D. 42:4, two things may be said. First, the substantival participle is the same one which was observed in D. 45:3, where it refers to the "lower" law oriented to man's sinful heart. Nevertheless, here in D. 42:4, Justin finds that this same division of the law is replete with signs that anticipate Christ's coming and the church. Second, by the genitive of personal agency (*ὑπὸ Μωυσέως*) Justin may suggest that these laws have a closer connection with Moses than with God. If this be true, it is quite possible that Ptolemy's idea of the Jewish law expressed in his letter to Flora arose from the basic idea to which Justin here gives expression. Ptolemy posited three sources for the law; (1) Laws given by Moses through inspiration, (2) Laws put forward by Moses apart from inspiration, and (3) Laws added by elders. A connection of Ptolemy with Justin in this respect has been

suggested by G. Quispel¹ though Quispel's appeal is made to D. 44 rather than to D. 45 and 42.

Summary: Like Ignatius, Justin shows a definite continuity with the Biblical idea of truth. He appeals to the God of the Old Testament who through word and event makes his truth known to men. He affirms that in the incarnate Logos, Jesus Christ, the truth of God has come to man in a unique and complete way. His philosophical mind, however, appears in the propositional and evidential form in which Biblical truth is cast thereby diminishing the newness of Divine revelation. The form is due—at least in part—to the demands laid upon the Apologist to defend Christians and the Christian faith. Justin is the defense attorney who is at all times concerned with the evidence for his case. The unequivocal fact remains, however, that Justin is a witness in the church of the second century to the presence of God's truth in Jesus Christ.

V. THE IDEA OF TRUTH IN *Evangelium Veritatis*

The writer of *Ev. Ver.* finds his principle of truth in God, "the Father of truth" (16:33). Thus, his Biblical orientation is certain. Apart from this comparison, however, the relationship between *Ev. Ver.* and the Bible is basically one of contrast. The Bible is theocentric: *Ev. Ver.* is anthropocentric. The Bible relates the self-revelation of God in creation and history and describes his eschatological purpose which reached its climax in the incarnation of Jesus. By contrast, *Ev. Ver.* is oriented toward man. The writer is not concerned with a God who reveals himself in history. He implies that nothing significant happened before Christ came (20:4-9), and that, apart from the coming of Jesus, no event deserves mention.² Since *Ev. Ver.* lacks any distinct history, it likewise lacks eschatology. Throughout his work, the writer has to do with man who is in Error and who lacks the Truth which essentially belongs to him. Truth, according to *Ev. Ver.*, means the recovery by man of his own nature (21:11-14) and high origin

¹ Ptolémée, *Lettre à Flora*, p. 84. Cf. also "La Lettre de Ptolémée à Flora," *VC*, 2 (1948), p. 40, by the same writer. The article is substantially the same as the book, though the book contains the added feature of Quispel's edition of the Greek text of the letter.

² The appearance of Jesus in 19:17 ff., is abrupt and entirely unconnected with any prior event.

(22:2-4). The parables of *Ev. Ver.* support the thesis.¹ Whereas the parables of the gospels are concerned with the Kingdom of God, i.e. with the Divine activity pursuant to the Divine goal, the parables of *Ev. Ver.* are almost wholly concerned with man. Thus, *Ev. Ver.* shows: (1) A concern with man's recovery of the gnosis of his true self thereby ousting the ignorance of Error into which he has fallen, and (2) A concern with man's realization of completeness or fullness through the Father's gnosis which replaces man's lack.

To be sure, *Ev. Ver.* refers to the "events" of the incarnation and death of Jesus. Truth, however, for the writer of *Ev. Ver.*, lies not so much in the event itself as it does in the meaning which the event contains. The meaning centers in man. For example, in 19:17 ff., the "event" of Jesus' coming including the subsequent response to his teaching ministry by the "little children" (19:28-29) soon dissipates into a glorified description of the meaning of his coming. That is, the little children become the living book of the living ones (19:35-36) or "letters of truth" (23:8-9) through whom the gnosis of the Father can be realized. The meaning of the event is that which the writer finds important. At Jesus' coming, the true nature of the Gnostic believers appears. According to the writer, the coming of Jesus embraces two major "events"—his incarnation and death. The writer's concern in both "events" is to discover their meaning. Thus, in 26:8, the incarnation is recorded in two brief words, ⲁϥⲡⲟⲩⲙⲁⲗ, "He became a body," but the meaning that follows is described in great detail. The incarnation, says the writer, is the means whereby empty vessels (= a-gnostic men) are clearly distinguished from full vessels (= the Gnostics). The incarnation means the coming of gnosis (26:23-27) and truth (26:27-32) and the complete defeat of Error (26:16-23). The second decisive event is the death of Jesus. Here also the interpretative element appears especially strong. Thus, in 18:24, after describing Jesus' death by means of two brief words, ⲁⲩⲁϥⲧⲩⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲩⲱϥ, "He was nailed to wood" (= the cross), the writer proceeds immediately to express the meaning of the cross—as he sees it. Jesus, he says, becomes the fruit of the Father's gnosis. The fruit does not perish as men eat it but it gives men joy as well as a share in God himself (18:24-33). The same two Coptic words ⲁⲩⲁϥⲧⲩⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲩⲱϥ, "He was nailed

¹ Cf. proposition II in chapter III.

to wood," occur in 20:25 where again the writer's emphasis slights the historical fact but enhances the interpretative element in which man is the center of interest.

In a remarkable passage (31:28-35), the author orients the meaning of Jesus' person and work to Gnostics in a five-fold way. The passage reads:

"He became a Way for the straying,
And Gnosis for the ignorant,
A Discovery for those seeking,
And Strength for the faltering,
Immaculateness for the defiled."

The passage is somewhat parallel to Justin's Dialogue with Trypho (100:4; 126:1), where Justin cites a host of names that Christ is said to bear. "He has been called," says Justin, "at times Angel of great counsel, and man by Ezekiel, and as Son of man by Daniel, and child by Isaiah, and Christ and God to be worshiped by David, and Christ and Stone by many, and Wisdom by Solomon, and Joseph and Judah and Star by Moses, and East by Zechariah, and a Suffering one and Jacob and Israel again by Isaiah, and Rod and Blossom and Cornerstone and Son of God..." (126:1). Justin's purpose, of course, is to convince Trypho of the deity of Christ and thus, as evidence to Trypho, he amasses the multitude of names that Christ is said to bear. The passage is theocentric. The truth consists of the exalted names which belong to Christ. With the evidence, Justin hopes to win over Trypho to the truth which he presents. The passage from *Ev. Ver.* 31:28-35 is anthropocentric. The writer is concerned with the straying, the ignorant, the seeking, the faltering, and the defiled, and what Jesus can become to them. Admittedly, there is a meditative tone to the passage not unlike 1 Cor. 1:30 where Paul speaks to Christians as follows: "Now you are of him in Christ Jesus who became for us wisdom from God, both righteousness, and sanctification and redemption," Paul's meditation, however, unlike that of *Ev. Ver.*, is rooted in the event of Calvary (1 Cor. 1:18), which event was the basis of God's wisdom and power. So persistent was Paul's emphasis on the Divine event that the preaching of it was a continual offense to the Jews and an object of ridicule to the Greeks (1 Cor. 1:23). Paul's cognitive power—always oriented toward both God and man—was ever rooted in the truth of the Divine historical event. The writer of *Ev. Ver.* is primarily

concerned with the existential situation of man and thus he disregards God's action in history.

Such is the general tenor of *Ev. Ver.* The document begins with the claim that there is a manifestation of the gospel of truth from the Father of truth (16:31-33) but it closes with a unique stress on man becoming truth. That is, the word for truth, **Ἀλήθεια**, which is joined to both "gospel" and "Father" (16:31-33), also describes the essential nature of man (42:25-28). The passage reads, "But they [i.e. the Gnostics] indeed are the Truth, and the Father exists in them and they in the Father." The difference between *Ev. Ver.* and the Bible that comes to a point in this text involves cosmology, anthropology, and the total concept of history. *Ev. Ver.* senses that history—what history there is—moves in a cycle *from* an original Oneness *back to* that original Oneness, that the cosmos is, on the whole, a temporary disrupting force, and that man's destiny is not forward but backward to recover what he once had, but lost. In attaining his goal, man needs a gnosis of God's nature which is truth. The individual personality of man is caught up and absorbed into that truth. In brief, God's goal is viewed as the actualization of that which is potential in man. In almost every area of comparison. *Ev. Ver.* forms a contrast with the Bible, and especially with the New Testament. History in the Bible moves forward as God gradually reveals his will and destiny for man. God reveals not what is but what is to be. Man's presence in this world does not constitute a departure from God but is an integral part of God's purpose. God's revelation in history is not basically a revelation of what man is, but of what God is doing for man and giving to man. Man is made in the image of God, i.e. he is the one creature on earth made for communication with God. God is at work in history to keep the lines of communication open with his creatures. The fall (Gen. 3) meant a self-imposed blackout which God's grace penetrated and overcame. The Bible as opposed to *Ev. Ver.*, sees that man's basic need is not gnosis of God's nature but of his will. Man is set here to do the will of God. In this respect there is a remarkable link between the first and last books of the Bible. After God creates man, he gives him a job to do (cf. the LXX ἐργάζεσθαι in Gen. 2:5, 15, for the Hebrew עָבַד). Moreover, after man is redeemed and has reached God's final goal, his job remains in force, for "His servants shall continue to serve him" (Rev. 22:3). The change from the more mundane

word ἐργάζεσθαι (Gen. 2:5, 15) to λατρεύειν (Rev. 22:3)—a word that always has religious connotation—may in itself witness to God's continuous activity in history—for man and in man—to bring man to the goal of a life lived for God—always in the truth that He continues to give through Christ. *Ev. Ver.* constantly speaks of the rest that believers find in the Father, an emphasis that is present in the New Testament. But the New Testament contains the plus-factor, a dynamic element in that man through God's grace and power fulfills the will of God in active service. The dynamic element comes from God and is expressed in the service man renders to him. In brief, as over against *Ev. Ver.*, the Bible pictures God's goal as accomplishing for man and in man that which he has promised to him. As over against the goal of *Ev. Ver.* where man becomes the truth which God is, the Biblical goal insists that truth is in Jesus (Eph. 4:21), that, by faith, man *knows* the true one and is *in* the true one (1 John 5:20) and hence, man can walk in the light of God's truth and serve the God of truth. The creature which God made for fellowship with him is, as Augustine said, restless till he finds rest in him. But that creature remains God's creature and ever continues to do God's will.

Summary and Comparison

Justin's concern centers in the truth of the historical event, predicted by God's prophets, fulfilled in his Son: the concern of the writer of *Ev. Ver.* focuses on the truth which the "event" contains for the Gnostic community. In his search for the meaning of the event, the writer of *Ev. Ver.* is, on the one hand, reacting against a factual mechanical approach to the nature of truth such as Justin so frequently represents. On the other hand, the writer of *Ev. Ver.* is reflecting something of the approach to truth that is found in Paul and John in the New Testament and—to a lesser degree—in Ignatius (letters to the Philadelphians and Trallians). In the New Testament, the cross is seen to be the place where God's love (John) and righteousness (Paul) become manifest. What the writer of *Ev. Ver.* affirms is that the cross manifests the gnosis of God. The writer's purpose to understand the event is admirable but his work was doomed to "oblivion," the very term which the writer decries. Both John and Paul understood the cross as the fulfillment of God's purpose in history and as the *raison d'être* of a new community of believers which was formed

to bear witness to God's truth in the world. The meaning of the cross for both apostles was inextricably bound up with the cross itself and the history of God's people which led up to the cross. *Ev. Ver.* is lacking on both counts. The writer of *Ev. Ver.* was justly dissatisfied with mere facts void of meaning for life. Truth, he says, must reach the life of man where he is—in Error. Nevertheless, the idea of truth which *Ev. Ver.* espouses is like the second house in Jesus' parable—without foundation and thus to be swept away in the storms of oppression and persecution. In contrast, the greatness of Justin Martyr lies in his consistent witness to the truth revealed in God's dealings with his ancient people and the truth to be found in the fulfillment of his prophetic word in the incarnation, death, and resurrection, of Jesus. In spite of his failure to wrestle with the real meaning of the cross, Justin stood firm as a bold witness to God's truth in behalf of his suffering brethren.

CONCLUSION

The investigation that has been pursued above reveals that the theological position of the church, ca. A.D. 155-160, was ambiguous or uneven. On the one hand, Justin Martyr exemplifies an orthodox position which is faithful to the Biblical revelation through the Old Testament prophets and through the apostles of Jesus. The problem which the Apologist poses for the church is that of presenting the truth of God as something less than the Bible proclaims. On the other hand, the writer of *Ev. Ver.* expresses an overt thoroughgoing realism which, while accepting Divine revelation as a base, constructs an ontological system which exceeds by far the bounds of Biblical data. Both writers exercise a certain freedom in their understanding; (1) of truth and the Bible, and (2) of truth and speculative thought. This freedom may be summarized in three areas of concern which relate respectively to Christology, cosmology, and soteriology.

1. *The Father and Jesus*

Both Justin and the writer of *Ev. Ver.* distinguish between the Divine persons. Both affirm that God is the Father of all truth, that he is incomprehensible and beyond every thought of man, that he gives meaning to all that is, and that he manifests himself through Jesus. Both state that the Logos comes from the Father and enters the world to reveal the Father. According to *Ev. Ver.*, revelation comes through the Logos or the Son, without precedent or preparation. Like Marcion, the writer of *Ev. Ver.* eliminates the birth narratives and introduces Jesus on the scene of "history" with a sudden abruptness. The writer categorically denies any Divine manifestation before the coming of Jesus. Moreover, he suggests that the flesh which Jesus assumed at his coming (= his incarnation) was not material but of a heavenly substance, a flesh apparently identical with the Gnostics themselves. Perhaps the writer aimed both to enhance the relationship of Jesus to the Father and to suggest that the Gnostics enjoy a unique contemporaneity with Jesus. The result, however, is a Christology which lacks the Old Testament base, on the one hand, and transforms the New Testament heritage, on the other. It is not so with

Justin. First, the Apologist understands that the Logos manifested the Father's will before his incarnation, appearing to Jews as the second God, to Gentiles as the spermatic Logos. Second, contrary to the writer of *Ev. Ver.*, Justin affirms the reality and/or factuality of the incarnation of the Logos. Christ, says Justin, was born of a virgin and indwelt by the full Logos of the Father. The Apologist alludes briefly (I. 32:9) to a heavenly element in the blood of Jesus, but, on the whole, he insists on Jesus' full humanity or his full identification with mankind (II. 10:1). Basically Justin stands on the Christian tradition. Christ is the *apostolos* and the *angelos* of God—able to represent God before men; he is the *dunamis* of God—able to change the lives of men; he is the *logos* of God—able to interpret the truth of God to men.

2. *The world and evil*

The lines of contrast between Justin and the writer of *Ev. Ver.* sharpen further as truth is seen in this area of concern. For Justin, the belief that God has made all things through his Logos means that there is a direct manifestation of truth in the world. Moreover, the Apologist cites events of history in which the pre-incarnate Logos revealed his power to the people of God. He refers to the wise teaching (through the philosophers) and the inspired utterances (through the prophets) by means of which the Logos anticipated his own full coming into the world as the fulfillment of both Jewish and pagan history. Justin is fully aware of opposition to truth in the world. He ascribes it to the evil nature within man and to the evil demons who always seek to defeat the Divine purpose. In *Ev. Ver.*, while the agency of the Logos in creation does not appear, the claim is made that the world does manifest Divine life. Truth, however, appears in the world as a heavenly stranger, without roots in history before Christ's coming and with little relation to time and place at his coming. The cosmos is viewed not as the scene of history but as the meeting place (= the Middle) where God attempts to draw men to himself out of the grip of Error and Forgetfulness. Evil or Error holds all men in darkness in the world. There is a hopelessness, frustration, and despair in the cosmos that only the dawning of the Father's gnosis can dispel.

3. *Man and redemption*

Justin reveals his debt to the Old Testament by ascribing

man's creation to God. Due to his philosophical orientation, he claims that seeds of the Logos are in all men. There is thus a God-given capacity within man to respond to truth. Justin, however, knows of no understanding of truth apart from Christ and the prophets. That is, truth is found in the events which God promised through the prophets and fulfilled in Jesus Christ. Justin insists that what God put within man by creation enables man freely to appropriate what God has done for him by Christ's redemption. In spite of the activity of demons, and in spite of the evil desire within, man can be persuaded and reborn by the power of the cross and won over to a new life lived according to the commandments of Christ—in the Christian fellowship and in the world—in anticipation of the final salvation at the second *parousia*.

The writer of *Ev. Ver.* acknowledges no debt to the Old Testament account of creation, but like Justin, he claims that there is a spiritual seed within man. Unlike Justin, however, he ascribes the seed to the Gnostics alone. That is, over against Justin's cherished belief in man's free will, the writer of *Ev. Ver.* defends Divine sovereignty. The Gnostics alone, he says, have a name and existence. They alone are able to respond to the Divine call and rise up to the one who calls them. At the same time, their response is conditioned. The Gnostics themselves must engage in a careful search for the truth even though they are wholly dependent on the illuminating power of the Holy Spirit for an understanding of truth. The Holy Spirit is said to raise men from a life void of meaning which they live in forgetfulness of their true origin, enable them to lay hold of the beloved Son, and interpret the truth of God's redemption to them. It must be added, however, that redemption according to *Ev. Ver.* does not reveal—as it does in Justin's works—*what God does* on the scene of history, but *who God is* in the sphere of human existence. *Ev. Ver.* thus constitutes a kind of theosophy. In the midst of a cosmos in which Error attempts to enmesh man in a material life, man, according to *Ev. Ver.*, discovers his own ignorance of the Father, realizes his own high origin in him, and experiences a meaningful relationship to him. Despite the fact that redemption in *Ev. Ver.* connotes no moral change within man, *Ev. Ver.*—far more than the writings of Justin—does make a serious attempt to encourage believers to think through the meaning of their existence, and correspondingly, the meaning of the incarna-

tion, the cross, and resurrection. In one sense, the attempt of the writer of *Ev. Ver.* to investigate theological truth was a necessary counterpart to the evidential and mechanical presentation of truth by Justin. It is the task of a church in any age to think through carefully and thoroughly the meaning and relation of truth to its own faith and life. The writer of *Ev. Ver.* attempted to do so. Nevertheless, history reveals that the viewpoint which he espoused failed, and rightly so. The church is free, yea rather it is incumbent upon the church, to investigate the meaning of truth. That investigation, however, is relevant only as the church is faithful to its heritage, a heritage that reflects what God has done for man in Jesus Christ. Herein lies the significance of Justin for the life of the church of A.D. 155-160. His approach to truth reflects the double claim of Jesus. Jesus said, "You will know the truth and the truth will set you free" (John 8:32). Justin recognizes the claim for he is a Christian. Whether presenting truth or defending it, he exercises a great deal of freedom, freedom in the way he uses the Scriptures (both the memoirs of the apostles and the writings of the prophets), freedom in employing philosophical tenets in order to press home his argument. Jesus also said, "I am . . . the truth" (John 14:6). Justin also recognizes this claim for both his Apologies and Dialogue state unequivocally that the truth is to be found in the Son of God who is at once the Jesus of history and the Christ who is worshiped in the church and proclaimed in the world.

INDEXES

I. REFERENCES TO THE BIBLE

A. Old Testament

<i>Genesis</i>			18:21	186	<i>Judges</i>	
1:1-5	122		19:9	183	9:16	182
1:2	60		20:3	183	9:19	182
1:26	96, 135		20:8-11	211	13:17-18	161
2:1-3	211		24:10	67	<i>Ruth</i>	
2:5	217f		33:20	67	3:12	182n
2:9	3		34:6	181, 184		
2:15	217f.		40:34	67	1 <i>Samuel</i>	
3:1ff.	217		40:35	193n	12:24	186
3:3	3				2 <i>Samuel</i>	
12:1-3	186n	<i>Numbers</i>			2:6	181
15:6	185f., 186n	5:22	182		1 <i>Kings</i>	
17:12	123	11:12	184		1:36	182
18:1-2	86	14:11	183		2:4	182, 186
18:10	86	20:12	183		3:6	182
18:13	181n	21:8-9	61, 116, 120		8:10	67
18:23-33	86	21:9	116, 117n		8:26	183, 187
19:24	86	22:37	182n		8:27	182n
20:12	182n				2 <i>Kings</i>	
20:13	186n	<i>Deuteronomy</i>			6:5	37
24:48-49	181	1:32	183		17:14	183
24:49	182	7:9	183f., 187		19:17	182n
28:10-17	86	9:23-24	183		20:3	182
31:10-13	86	17:4	181		1 <i>Chronicles</i>	
32:11 (Heb)	181, 185	21:23	xix. 115, 120n		17:23	183, 185
32:22-32	86	22:20	181		17:24	183
42:16	181, 186	27:15-26	182		21:16	15
47:29	182	27:26	xix, 120n		2 <i>Chronicles</i>	
49:10-11	209	29:15	72		1:9	183, 185
49:10	173	31:11	72		6:17	183, 185
49:11	105, 134	32:4	184		6:18	182n
49:25	72				19:9	182n
					20:20	183, 185
<i>Exodus</i>			<i>Joshua</i>			<i>Nehemiah</i>
3:1	86		2:1ff.	119		
3:6	184 f.		2:12	181f., 186	5:13	182
4:1	183		2:14	186	8:6	182
4:5	183		4:7	36f.	9:33	181
4:8	183		5:13ff.	87		
4:9	183		6:17	119		
4:30-31	186n		6:23	119		
4:31	183		6:25	119		
6:3	34, 161		7:20	182n		
14:31	183		24:14	186		

<i>Esther</i>		78:32	183	7:2	186
9:30	182n	86:11	182	7:9	183, 185f.
		88:12	182n, 183n	7:10-16	186
<i>Job</i>		88:53 (LXX)	182	7:14	209
1:5	173	89:2	182n, 183n	8:4	174
8:3	72	89:3	182n, 183n	9:5-6	17, 34
9:2	182n	89:6	182n	9:6	161
12:2	182n	89:9	182n	11:1-3	174
19:4	182n	89:14	193	11:5	182n, 187
19:5	182n	89:15	187	25:1	182n
25:2	72	89:25	182n, 183n	28:16	183
34:12	182n	89:34	182n, 183n	37:18	182n
36:4	182n	89:50	182n, 183n	38:3	182
42:5-6	67	92:3	182n, 183n	42	201
		93:5	183	42:6	158
<i>Psalms</i>		96:13	182n	43:10	183
2:7-8	159	98:3	182n, 183n	44:6	184, 188
12:2	183	100:5	182n, 183n	49	201
15:2	182n	105:48 (LXX)	182	49:7	183, 187
19:9	181	106:12	183	50	201
22	208	106:24	183	52:13-53:12	121, 201
22:1ff.	115, 120f.	110:1-3	175	52:13	201n
24:1ff.	170, 174	110:1	86	53:1	183
25:5	187	110:2	175	53:2	156
26:3	182	110:3	104	55:3	183
31:6	184	117:2	187	59:4	182n
31:24	183	119:30	182n	60:4	184
33:4-5	183n	119:66	183	65:16	182, 187
33:4-7	184	119:75	182n, 183n		
33:6	86	119:86	182n	<i>Jeremiah</i>	
36:1-4	184	119:88-90	183n	2:13	188
36:5-6	184, 187	119:90	182n	2:21	187
36:6	182n, 183n	119:138	182n	7:28	186
37:3	187	132:11	187	9:4 (Heb.)	182n
40:11	182n, 183n, 187	146:6	187	11:5	182, 187
40:12	183n			23:28	182n
40:14 (LXX)	182	<i>Proverbs</i>		28:6 (Heb.)	182
43:3	187	8:7	182n	31:31f.	80
45:6-7	86	12:19	182n	42:5	183
45:6-11	156	17:12	173	45:2	154n
46:1ff.	188	<i>Ecclesiastes</i>		46:10	170n
46:1	188	12:10	181n		
46:4	188			<i>Lamentations</i>	
46:7	188	<i>Isaiah</i>		3:22f	183n
51:8	182	1:10ff	210	4:5	184
58:2	182n	1:16-20	83		
61:8	187	1:21	184, 187	<i>Ezekiel</i>	
68:18	147	1:26	187	18:8	182
69:28	5	2:3	175	21:3-5	15
71:19 (LXX.)	182	5:1-7	194		
72:5	104	6:8	186	<i>Daniel</i>	
78:22	183	7:1ff.	207, 209	8:26	182n

<i>Hosea</i>		<i>Amos</i>		8:3	187
2:21-22 (Heb.).	183n.	2	210	8:16	182n
187		5:18-20	170n	<i>Malachi</i>	
7:15	173	<i>Zechariah</i>		2:6	182n
<i>Joel</i>		3:1ff	175		
2:1ff.	170n	3:2	175		
2:28f.	147	7:9	182		

B. New Testament

<i>Matthew</i>		<i>Luke</i>		5:22	12, 15
1:21	34, 124	1:1-4	xvi	5:30	13
2	xviii	1:2	111	5:31	194
5:8	5	1:31	124	5:33	194
7:2	15	2:11	124	5:36	194
11:4-6	186n	3:23	109	6:38	13
11:25	5, 160	4:18-19	186n	6:44	22, 26
13:44-46	154	7:48	29	6:55	193f.
13:55	109	14:5	22	6:63	148
16:1	5	15:1-2	97	6:66	13, 106
16:16-18	156	15:4-6	22	7:1	13
16:27	170n	15:3-7	21	7:16-17	21
18:2-6	5, 160	18:13	18	7:37-39	96
18:10	160	18:33	123n	8:14	194
18:12-14	21f.	20:19	124	8:23	8
19:3	5	22:20	xviii	8:26	193
19:28	170n	24:7	123n	8:29	12
21:45f.,	124	24:26-27	170n	8:32	194, 223
22:16	193	24:44	49	8:36	194
23:1ff.	5	<i>John (192n)</i>		8:40	193f.
24:44	173	1:1	12, 106, 193	8:44	198
25:35-36	24	1:3	52, 72, 86	8:45	194, 198
26:6-13	26	1:12	161	8:46	194
26:39	13	1:14	12, 106, 192, 193,	10:1-18	21
26:42	13		194f., 199	10:11	96
28:18-20	24	1:15	193	10:17	122n, 132
<i>Mark</i>		1:17	195	10:18	50, 104n, 122n
1:11	12	1:18	128, 148, 193	10:23	13
1:45	4	1:36	13, 106	10:25-30	21f.
2:5	29	2:19	122	10:30	34
3:27	25	2:20	122	10:30f.	124
4:22	73	3:3-6	157	11:8	100
9:9	123n	3:14-15	120	12:3-8	26
9:10	123n	3:16	12, 52, 106	12:23	161n
9:31	123n	3:21	193f.	12:24	125
10:34	123n	3:33	193	12:28	161n
10:45	6	4:14	96	12:31	106
12:1-12	170n	4:23	89	12:32	22, 26
13:26	170n	4:23-24	193	12:38	73
14:3-9	26, 81	5:17-30	106	13:27	40
14:9	26	5:20ff.	12	14:6	193, 196f., 199, 223

14:8	12	<i>Romans</i>	11:10	194
14:9	33, 67	1:20	12:4	69
14:23	125	1:25	12:6	194
15:1	187, 193	2:1	13:8	194
15:1-7	194	2:6-11	13:12	165
15:26	194, 197	3:4	<i>Galatians</i>	
16:7	194	4:14	1:4	127n
16:12-15	20	4:19-21	1:9	111
16:13-15	148	5:5	1:13-19	65n
16:13	194, 196f.	6:17	2:5	194, 196
16:14	20	8:29	2:14	194, 196
16:28	93, 109n	9-11	3:10	xix
17:1-5	12, 161n, 198	9:1	3:13	xix 120, 201n
17:6	33, 52, 131n	9:20	4:16	192n
17:7-9	131n	9:21-23	5:7	194, 196n
17:11-12	131n	11:26	<i>Ephesians</i>	
17:14	52	11:33	1:4	31, 162
17:16	52	11:36	1:13	194, 196
17:17	198	16:16	3:10	45
18:9	131n	<i>I Corinthians</i>	4:15	192n
18:17	37	1:8	4:21	193, 194n, 196, 199, 218
18:37	194	1:18	4:25	95
20:1ff	197	1:23	5:9	194
20:1-10	197	1:30	5:22-24	50
20:9	123n	2:12	6:14	194
20:11-18	197	3:9	<i>Philippians</i>	
20:19-23	197	4:1	1:9	90
20:19	108, 132	6:20	2:5ff	47n, 132
20:22	148, 167, 197	8:6	2:6	12, 47n
20:23	197	11:2	2:7	47n
20:24-29	197	11:23	2:8	50
20:26	108, 132	12:1ff.	2:11	12
<i>Acts</i>		12:3	3:20-21	170n
1:8	24	15:3	4:3	5
1:15	166	15:20-28	<i>Colossians</i>	
2:1	166	15:26	1:5	194, 196
2:24	123n	15:53-54	1:15	31, 128
2:32	123n	16:20	1:16	86
2:44	166	<i>2 Corinthians</i>	1:18	31
2:47	166	2:14-16	1:27	40
3:13	200f.	3:2-3a	2:14	129, 130n
3:18-21	170n	3:3	2:14-15	50
3:26	200f.	3:6	3:4	129
4:27	200f.	4:2	3:9-10	50, 132
6:14	111	4:10	<i>I Thessalonians</i>	
10:41	123n	4:11	1:3	27n
10:42	15	5:1	1:9-10	170n
13:33-34	123n	5:2-4		
17:3	123n	6:7		
17:31	15, 123n	7:14		
19:39-40	156			
22:25	154			

2:13	III	11:31	119	<i>Revelation</i> (50n, 192n)
3:2	162	12:2-3	127	1:5 31
4:1	III	<i>James</i>		1:7 170n
4:13-18	170n	2:25	119	1:10 122
4:14	123n	<i>1 Peter</i>		2:9 202
5:2	170n	1:10-11	170n	2:12 15
5:26	165	1:20	129	2:16 15
<i>2 Thessalonians</i>		2:24	130n	2:17 35
2:2	170n	<i>2 Peter</i>		3:5 5
2:10	194	3:9	52	3:7 199
3:6	III	<i>1 John</i> (192n)		3:9 202
<i>1 Timothy</i>		1:2	129	3:12 35, 161
2:13-15	103	1:6	194	3:14 199
2:15	104	2:15	52	5:1 126n
3:1	205n	2:21	194, 198	5:3-5 126
3:8	205n	3:5	129	5:5 208
3:16	82n, 129	3:8	129	5:6 126
4:16	24	3:9	42	5:12 126
<i>2 Timothy</i>		3:18	194	6:10 199
2:20	96, 97n	3:19	194	6:11 99
2:20-21	96	4:2	20	7:1-8 99
<i>Titus</i>		4:7-8	90	13:8 126
1:3	129	4:9	129	14:1 35, 161
2:2-8	205n	5:2-3	90	15:3 199
<i>Hebrews</i> (50n)		5:19	52	16:7 199
1:2	86, 161	5:20	194, 218	19:2 199
1:6	31	<i>2 John</i> (192n, 198, 202)		19:9 199
1:13	22	1	194	19:11 197, 199
2:17	127	4	194	19:15 15
4:1	173	7	20	20 xix
4:12	15	<i>3 John</i> (192n, 198, 202)		20:1ff 170n
8:8	xviii	3-4	194	21:1-4 40
9:26	129			21:5 199
11:23	131			21:22-27 40
				22:2 125
				22:3 217f.
				22:4 161
				22:6 199

II. REFERENCES TO THE GOSPEL OF TRUTH

16:31	xvi 10n, 12, 51n	16:34-36	112	17:4ff.	13, 77
16:31-33	217	16:35	I	17:4-6	90
16:31-17:4	125	16:35-36	5, 162	17:4-7	52
16:31-17:9	1f.	16:37-17:1	128	17:4-8	94
16:31-35	40	16:38	124	17:4-10	89
16:32-33	1, 6, 70,	16:39	124	17:5-6	1, 141
16:32-34	143	16:39-17:1	2, 124, 139	17:5	71, 76
16:33	xvi, 10n, 69, 71,	17:2-3	73	17:6-9	72
	143n, 159, 171, 214	17:3	81, 154n	17:7-8	51n, 69
16:33-35	80	17:3-4	4, 144	17:8-9	69
16:34	76, 88	17:4	124, 153	17:9ff	8, 144

17:9-10	2	18:24-33	215	19:34-20:1	44, 130
17:9-14	45n, 89, 94	18:25	159		143
17:9-18:14	2, 3	18:26-29	3, 4	19:34-20:3	50, 126
17:13-14	89	18:26	3	19:34ff.	5
17:14	89	18:26-27	125	19:35-36	9, 51n, 162,
17:15	144n	18:28-29	47, 51n, 140		215
17:15-16	89	18:28	3, 171	19:35-20:1	5
17:16-18	89	18:29-19:7	171	19:36	130
17:19-21	2	18:29-31	125	19:36-20:1	130
17:20	144	18:29-33	4	19:36-20:3	162
17:22	51n	18:29	81, 154n	20:1	72n
17:22-23	69	18:31-32	51n, 69	20:1-2	72
17:24	2	18:33-34	153	20:2	72n
17:28	144	18:35	71	20:3-6	126
17:28-29	22, 53, 90,	18:37	171	20:3-9	126
	144, 145	18:38-39	171	20:3-14	126
17:28-37	94	18:38-40	95	20:3-38	6
17:29	144n	18:39-40	171	20:4-9	214
17:33ff.	89	19:6-7	4	20:5-6	126-127
17:33-36	47, 76, 77	19:7-8	72	20:6-9	52, 126, 128,
17:34	77, 90, 144	19:8-10	90		140, 162
17:34-35	76, 89, 138n	19:10-14	90, 92, 160	20:7	49n
17:34-36	124	19:10-17	70	20:8	112n
17:36	2, 144n	19:14-20	113	20:8-9	76, 126, 128
17:36-37	73	19:15-17	90	20:10	128
18:4ff	89	19:17ff.	215	20:10-14	6, 126
18:4-5	45n	19:17-22:20	4-8	20:11	82n
18:5-7	169	19:17-24:21	80	20:12	127n
18:5-15	2	19:17	4, 8, 13, 47,	20:12-13	127
18:7	139		160	20:13	127
18:7-9	45n	19:18-20	76	20:13-14	6, 127, 128
18:8	2	19:19	34, 47n, 112	20:14-20	127, 130
18:11-15	124	19:19-20	xix	20:15	127
18:12-13	153	19:19 ff.	112	20:15-16	128
18:13	73	19:19-20	112	20:16	71
18:13-14	143	19:20	4	20:16-17	128
18:15-19:17	2-4	19:21	4, 5, 138	20:17	128
18:15-21	3, 50, 80,	19:21-23	138	20:18	72
	90, 124	19:23	112, 139	20:18ff.	71
18:16	32, 82n	19:25-26	112, 139	20:18-19	128
18:17	32	19:26	138	20:19	71, 72
18:19-20	92	19:25-27	139	20:19-20	33, 128
18:19-21	113, 124	19:28-29	5, 159, 215	20:20	127n
18:21-19:17	80	19:28-30	112, 162	20:20-21:2	127
18:21-23	112	19:28	4, 5, 160	20:22-23	128
18:21-24	3, 8, 124	19:29	5	20:22-25	73
18:22	144n	19:30-32	13	20:22-28	128
18:24	76, 124, 129,	19:31-32	160	20:23	128
	215	19:32	139, 140	20:23-24	162
18:24ff	3	19:34-20:14	127	20:23-27	140
18:24-25	3	19:34-20:27	130	20:24-25	109, 134
18:24-26	13, 124, 140,	19:34-35	162	20:24	82n, 128
	168	19:34-36	73, 126	20:25	76, 128, 216

20:25-27	128, 129	22:5-6	8	23:17	10
20:26	131	22:7-9	8, 76	23:18-20	11, 106
20:27	76, 128	22:9-13	8	23:18-33	8, 10, 11, 80,
20:27-28	51, 129, 132	22:9	99		95, 105, 168
20:28-21:2	132	22:10	99	23:18	10
20:28-29	132	22:11-12	140	23:19-20	11
20:28-34	50	22:13-15	139	23:19-24	106
20:29-30	132	22:13-20	8, 91	23:19	106
20:30-34	6, 132	22:16-19	44n	23:20	106
20:30-32	6	22:20-23:2	8	23:23-24	10
20:30-37	167	22:20-23:3	168	23:24-26	52n
20:33-34	132	22:20-21	8, 144	23:30-31	12, 105, 106
20:34-21:2	133	22:21-24	8		108
20:36-21:1	6	22:21	144n	23:31-32	49n
20:37-38	144	22:24	144n	23:31-33	106
20:37	133	22:25-27	9	23:33-24:3	106
20:38-39	140	22:27-30	51	23:33-24:6	8, 12
20:38	133	22:28	32	23:33ff.	11
20:39-21:2	133	22:28-29	9, 47	23:33-35	106
20:39	133	22:29-30	9	23:33-34	106
21:3-6	6	22:31-33	69	23:33-24:7	108
21:3-5	143	22:33-23:3	169	23:33-24:9	168
21:6-7	6, 14, 139	22:33-35	9	23:34-35	108n
21:7-8	7	22:33-36	168	23:34	108n
21:8-23	7	22:35-36	162, 168	23:35	159
21:8-11	2, 52	22:35-23:2	9	24:4ff	72
21:8-9	171	22:35	99	24:4-6	13
21:9-10	153	22:38-39	44	24:5	13
21:11-14	6, 213	22:38-29:1	73	24:6-25:25	8, 13
21:12-13	153	22:39	9	24:6-21	13
21:15	139	23:2-16	169	24:6-7	13, 112
21:18-19	47n	23:2-18	8	24:7	13
21:19-22	6	23:2	44n	24:8	82n
21:22-23	153	23:3-7	9, 44	24:9-21	14
21:23-22:19	7	23:3-18	9, 11, 44, 162,	24:9	73
21:23-27	7		168	24:9-14	148
21:23	143	23:3ff.	51n, 162	24:10-11	147
21:24	7	23:3	9	24:12-13	33
21:26-27	7	23:5	10	24:14-17	169
21:27	7	23:8-9	xiv	24:14	13
21:28-30	7	23:8-10	10	24:15	14
21:35	7	23:8-18	9	24:16-18	144
21:35-36	139	23:8-9	44, 95, 215	24:17	13, 153
21:36-37	7	23:10	139	24:18-19	14
21:37	7	23:11-18	94	24:21-25:25	81
21:38	139	23:11	10n, 94	24:21-25:7	14
22:2-4	214, 215	23:11-12	10n	24:21	13
22:2-7	153	23:12-13	53, 168	24:21-32	95
22:3-19	7	23:13-16	169	24:23-24	14, 112
22:3	7	23:14-15	45, 168	24:23	14
22:3-4	7, 139	23:14-16	44	24:25-28	14
22:4-5	143	23:16-18	169	24:28-32	14
22:4-7	8	23:17-18	10	24:32-25:3	95

24:32	I4	26:7	106	28:1	17
24:35-36	96, 172	26:8-18	16	28:2	17
24:37-38	172	26:8	15, 97, 105, 106, 107, 215	28:3-5	17, 88n
25:2	14, 172	26:8ff.	16, 47	28:3-6	140
25:2-3	14	26:11-12	97	28:7	159
25:3-11	169	26:16-23	106, 215	28:11-12	47n, 52
25:3-12	44n	26:18-27	16	28:12-13	139
25:4-5	172	26:19	144n	28:13	47
25:6	14	26:23-27	106, 108, 215	28:16-18	35
25:7-8	169, 172	26:25-26	16	28:18	17
25:7-19	14	26:26	144n	28:19	17
25:8-17	44	26:27-28	40, 76, 77, 112, 143	28:20	17
25:9-10	40	26:27-32	106, 215	28:22-23	139
25:9-11	172	26:27f.	76	28:22-24	17, 47, 52
25:9	172	26:28	167	28:24-25	17
25:10-12	14	26:28-29	16	28:26-28	30, 100n
25:10-19	14	26:28-32	40	28:26-32	93
25:10	14, 172	26:29	143	28:26-33	145
25:11-12	139	26:30-31	10n, 16	28:26ff.	17, 18
25:12	14, 172	26:31-32	16	28:28-31	18
25:12-19	96	26:33-34	148	28:31	17
25:13	139, 172	26:34	148n	28:32-30:14	18, 52, 93, 148
25:15	139, 172	26:35-36	147	28:32-29:8	18, 93
25:15-17	139	27:3-4	148	28:32	18
25:19-25	172, 173	27:3	148n	29:1-2	18
25:19-20	172	27:5	73	29:1	18
25:19-22	138	27:6	73	29:5	18
25:19-25	15, 53	27:7	73	29:8-11	19
25:19-24	47	27:8-9	148	29:8-25	18
25:21	172, 173	27:8	33	29:8-31	93
25:22	172, 173	27:9-33	17, 81	29:8	18, 19
25:23-25	172, 173	27:10-11	92, 93	29:13	93n
25:23	96, 97n, 172	27:10-13	92	29:25-26	19
25:25ff.	16, 96	27:10-15	92, 160	29:25-28	19
25:25-26:15	96, 106	27:14	32, 138	29:25-31	19
25:25-27:9	15, 81	27:15-21	140	29:25	19
25:25-35	96	27:16-17	140	29:28-31	19
25:31	96, 97n	27:17-18	140	29:28-32	93
25:34	97	27:26-29	143	29:32-35	19
25:35ff.	108	27:29-36	140	29:32-30:14	19
25:35-26:1	15	27:30-33	47	29:32-33	19
25:35-26:18	145	27:31-32	140	29:32	19
25:35	97	27:34-28:31	17, 35	29:33-35	94
25:35ff.	108	27:34-28:32	81	30:4-5	94
25:36	97	27:34-35	53	30:5	94
26:1-4	15	27:34-36	53n	30:6-12	19
26:4	106, 112n	27:35-36	140	30:6-14	49, 107
26:4-5	47n, 76, 112	27:36	17, 47, 52	30:12-14	19, 94
26:4-6	44	27:36-28:2	47	30:13	138
26:4-10	106	28:1-3	17, 140	30:14-15	19
26:4ff.	15, 96, 97			30:14	19
26:5-6	15, 45, 106			30:14-32	81, 148
26:7-15	96				

30:14-22	107	31:31	81	33:18	24n
30:15	19, 148n	31:32	153	33:19-21	25, 167
30:17	19, 148n	31:35-32:16	88, 97	33:20	76, 144n
30:19	167	31:35-32:30	21, 81	33:22-23	25
30:19ff.	167	31:35-32:4	21	33:24-30	25
30:19-23	140	31:35	21	33:30-31	25
30:19-26	20	32:2	154	33:32	139
30:22-23	140	32:3-4	22, 52n	33:33-35:23	81, 162
30:22-25	107	32:4-17	21	33:33-35:22	25
30:23-25	148	32:9-17	xvii 98	33:33-35	25
30:23-26	11	32:12	22, 77, 144	33:33ff.	28
30:24-25	73, 139	32:15	88	33:35-39	25
30:24	20	32:16-17	22, 106	33:39	25
30:26	20	32:16	22	33:39ff.	88n
30:26ff.	107	32:17	22	33:39-34:1	25
30:26-32	107	32:18-22	22	33:39-34:14	171
30:28-32	20	32:18	76	34:1-2	139
30:30-35	50	32:22-24	23, 53	34:1	163
30:32-31:35	81	32:22-30	22, 23	34:4	163
30:32-34	113	32:22	22, 23n	34:5-7	26
30:32	73	32:23	22	34:5-6	26, 163
30:33-34	51n, 69	32:23-24	76	34:6	163
30:34-35	107, 148	32:24-25	23	34:8-9	26
30:34-36	107	32:26	23	34:9-12	26
30:36-31:1	107	32:26ff	53	34:9-18a	26
31:1	138n	32:26-30	23	34:10	163
31:1-35	20	32:31-33:32	23, 81, 154	34:10-11	147, 163
31:1-2	20			34:10-12	163
31:1-4	52, 138n	32:31-34	154	34:11	163
31:2	138n	32:31-37	24, 25	34:12-13	163
31:2-3	107	32:31	24, 53, 154	34:12-18	26
31:3-4	20, 107, 138n, 139	32:32	40	34:12	26, 27n
		32:35	24, 53, 154	34:13	26
31:4	20, 107, 138	32:37	29, 144n	34:13-14	163
31:4-5	20	32:38	22	34:18-34	26, 27
31:4-7	107, 108n	32:38-39	22, 23, 138	34:18-22	27
31:4-9	107, 108, 138	33:1-35	53	34:19	138
		33:1-32	24, 25	34:20	167
31:5	105, 107	33:1-8	24, 25	34:24	27
31:5-8	132	33:1-5	25	34:25-26	27n, 167
31:6-7	20n, 108n	33:1-2	154	34:25	167
31:7-9	108	33:3	155	34:26	27n, 163
31:9-35	21	33:6-8	155	34:26-27	27
31:9-20	21	33:8-11	24	34:27	27
31:9-11	109, 113	33:8	40, 138	34:28	32
31:12-13	113	33:11-23	25	34:28ff.	27
31:15-16	113	33:11-12	24	34:28-29	27, 49n
31:18-19	148	33:12-14	24	34:30-34	27
31:21-28	21	33:13	138	34:31	27n
31:25	144n	33:13-14	25	34:34-35:6a	27
31:28-35	21, 47, 216	33:14-16	24	34:34-36	26
31:30-31	168	33:14-18	24	34:34	81
31:31-32	154	33:17	138	34:35	81

34:36	81	36:39	31	39:7	34
34:36-35:6	144	36:39-37:3	31	39:8	34
34:37	153	37:2	31	39:9-20	34
35:1-10	29	37:3	31, 159	39:9	34
35:2-3	153	37:3-6	33	39:11-19	161
35:3	27n	37:4-18	31, 81	39:11-20	35
35:6-23	28	37:5-10	44	39:11-12	35
35:18-20	28	37:5-7	99	39:11-14	35, 71, 139
35:18	28, 144n	37:7	31	39:14-16	46n, 47n
35:20-22	28	37:8-9	31	39:15-16	35
35:20	154n	37:13-14	47n	39:15-20	47n
35:21-22	28	37:15-18	32	39:15	35
35:23	29	37:15-16	31	39:16	35
35:24-36:13	29, 30, 81	37:19-38:6	32, 33, 82	39:17	34, 35
35:24-26	29	37:19-21	32	39:18-19	34
35:24-27	29	37:21-24	32, 47	39:19-20	35
35:24	29	37:24-34	32	39:20-40:2	35
35:25	29	37:25-26	32	39:21	35
35:26	144n	37:28	32	39:22	36
35:27-28	29	37:29-34	32	39:23-24	34
35:27-29	29	37:33-34	32	39:23	161
35:27	29	37:33	32	39:24-26	36
35:29	29	37:34-37	32	39:27-28	36
35:30ff.	29	37:34-35	32	40:2-16	36
35:30	29	37:37-38	153	40:3-5	53
35:30-31	99	37:38	139	40:6-9	36
35:30-35	99, 155	37:37-38:6	33	40:5-6	36
35:30-36:5	88, 99	38:6-40:29	33, 82, 160	40:6	36
35:31-33	99	38:6-7	33, 34	40:8	36
35:34-35	99	38:7-8	34	40:7-9	37
35:35	88	38:7-9	34	40:9-10	161
35:35-37	100	38:9-10	34	40:10	37
35:35-36:5	30	38:10-11	34	40:13-16	37
36:1-3	30	38:11-12	161	40:16-29	38
36:7	100	38:11-15	34	40:16-17	161
36:11	154n	38:12-15	99	40:17	161
36:12-13	30	38:16-21	34	40:18-19	113
36:13-35a	30, 167	38:16-27	34	40:19-20	34
36:14	82n	38:17-21	34	40:19-22	113
36:15-35	81	38:17	161	40:26ff.	33
36:14-15	76	38:18-19	160	40:26-28	113
36:17-18	30	38:23-24	160, 161	40:30-41:12	171
36:19-20	30	38:24-27	34	40:30-43:24	38, 82
36:21-29	30, 88n	38:28-39:3	34	40:30-31	82
36:25-37:3	81	38:28	160	40:31-34	113
36:27-29	30n	38:28-29	160	41:5	38
36:28	168	38:29-30	34	41:4-5	113
36:29-32	30	38:29	161	41:5-12	82
36:29-35	31	38:31-32	34, 161	41:7	38
36:35-37:3	31	38:32	47	41:8-12	38
36:35ff.	31	38:36-37	34, 47, 161	41:8	38
36:36	31, 159	38:37	36	41:9-10	38, 171
36:36-39	77	39:3-8	34	41:10-11	171

41:12	153	42:11-17	40	42:40-43:3	41
41:13-14	48	42:14-15	153	42:40-43:8	53n
41:13	38	42:17-43:24	40	43:1	41, 48
41:14-15	38	42:17-18	77, 139	43:4-5	71, 72
41:15-16	38	42:18-30	40	43:3	41
41:16	40	42:21-23	40	43:6-7	41
41:17	38	42:25-26	10n, 40, 159,	43:7-8	48
41:19-20	38		171	43:8	76
41:20	39n	42:25-28	217	43:9-24	41
41:26	38	42:26-28	47n	43:9-10	41
41:28-35	39	42:26-30	171	43:10-11	47n, 48
41:28-29	39, 48	42:30	71	43:12-13	42
41:30-32	39	42:32-36	41	43:16-18	52n
41:32-35	39	42:31-32	140	43:16-24	42
41:35-42:2	39	42:36-37	41	43:20	159
41:35-42:17	39	42:35	159	43:22-24	159
42:3-6	39	42:39	41		
42:4-10	40	42:40-43:2	53n		

III. REFERENCES TO THE WRITINGS OF JUSTIN MARTYR

A. *The Dialogue with Trypho*

1-8	64	7:3	67, 79, 146n	28:2	158, 159
1-9	75, 79, 102	8:1	54n, 64, 65, 66, 79,	29:1	147, 157
1:2	54n		135, 146n, 157	29:2	67, 74, 150
1:4	57n	8:2	66, 67	29:3	69
2	54n, 55	9:2	83	30:1	117
2:1	54, 54n, 55 56n	10-30	210	30:2	83
2:1-2	54	10-31	80, 102	30:3	121
2:2	54, 55, 84	10	79	31:1	175
2:4	56, 135	10:1-2	166	32-141	80, 102
2:6	65n, 67	10:2	74, 110	32-54	79, 80, 170
2:6-3:1	65	11	80	32:1	115
3:1	65n	11:1	74	32:3	121
3:4	65	11:2-5	158, 210	32:5	117
3:4-4:1	65	11:4	79, 146, 209	34:2	103, 117
3:5	65	11:5	71	35:2	71, 110
4:1	60, 63, 65, 66	12	210	35:8	75, 114, 118
4:2	137	12:3	71	36:1	170
5:1-2	66	12:6	71	36:3-6	174
5:3	66	13:2-7	121	36:4	174
5:4	60n, 135	14:2	117, 135, 210	38:1	115
5:6	56n	14:8	170n	38:4	117
6	66	15:1	71	40-47	80
6:1	56n	18:2	71, 211	40-43	79
6:1-2	146	20:1	211	40:1	117, 146
6:2	135, 137	21:1	211	40:1-2	213
7-8	67	22:1	211	40:1-3	121
7:1-8:1	66	23:3	103, 158, 159	40:3	117
7:1	66, 79	23:4	150	40:4-5	121, 213
7:1-25:2	xiii	24:1	123, 150	41:1	117, 121, 135
7:2	67	24:2	63		213

41:1-3	165	59-60	86	88:4	109
41:4	71, 117, 123	60:2	87	88:8	109
42	213, 214	61:2	85	89-105	79, 102
42:1-2	213	61:3	104	89:2	115
42:1	75	62	87	90	115
42:2	121	62:1	83	90:2	208
42:3	156	62:2-4	135	90:5	117
42:4	213	62:4	85	91:1	85n
43	102	63-78	79	91:2	117
43:1	103, 211	63:1	103	91:3	117
43:5	103	63:2	209	91:4	117, 118, 150
43:8	103	63:4	117	92:1	117
44	214	63:5	156	92:4	150
44:1	150	64:3	120	93:2	117
44:4	135	65:7	83	93:3	83
45	214	66:1	83	93:4	120
45:2	212	67:3	150	94-96	120
45:3-4	211	67:6	117	94-95	120
45:3	118, 212n, 213	68:3	83	94:1	118
45:4	103, 108n, 118, 121, 212	68:5	83	94:2	118, 120
		69:2	209	94:5	118
46:4	118	69:3	109	95	120
47:1	118, 150	69:4-7	109	95:1	xix, 120
47:4	118	69:4	146	95:2-3	121
48:2	103	69:7	111	95:2	121
49:2	83, 117	70:3-4	165	96:1	xix, 121
49:3	75, 111	74:3	121	96:2	75, 149, 150
49:8	146, 174	75:4	103	97-106	120, 121, 208
50:1	103	76:2	105, 209	97:2	121
52:2-4	209	76:7	104	98-106	115
52:4	150	77-78	209	98:5	156
53:1-2	75	77:2	83	99:1	208
53:1	209	77:3-4	174	100:1	104n
53:2	85	78:6	117	100:2	103, 108n, 117
53:4	117	78:10-11	117	100:4	114, 156, 216
53:5	110	80:1-4	170	100:5-6	103 104n, 108
54:1	134, 209	80:1	158	100:5	147, 174
54:1-2	105	80:2	170n	100:6	117
54:2	174	81:4	xix	101:3	114
55-62	79	83:2-4	175	102:4	83
55:1	83	84:2	108n	102:5	114, 174
56	86, 100, 136n	85:1-5	174	104:1	114
56:4	83, 150	85:1	121	105:1	110, 114
56:5	83	85:2	85n, 121	105:5	114
56:6	83	85:4	83	105:6	114, 118
56:11	86, 150	86	79, 102, 115	106-108	79, 102
56:14	117	87:2-3	174	106:1	114, 122
57:2	83	87:2	103, 104	106:2	156
57:3	103	87:3-5	149	106:4	114
57:4	150	87:5	147	107:2	71, 150
58	86	87:6-88:1	147	108:2	110, 122
58:1	117, 170	88:2	109, 174	109 ff.	102
58:4	83	88:3-4	147	109-110	79

110:3	83	120:6	xv	128:3-4	85
110:6	75, 149, 208	121:2	63	128:4	83, 85, 104
111-114	79, 170	122:1	157, 158	129:4	85, 104
111:1	117, 121	122:2	158	130-135	79
111:3	119, 121	122:3	156, 157, 158,	131:2	118
111:4	119, 120		159	131:4	117
112:1	118	122:4	159	133:1	75
113:2-3	162n	122:5	156, 158, 159	134:3	156
114-124	79	122:6	159	134:5	121
114:1	117	123:1	159	135:2-3	155
114:2	121	123:6-7	155	135:3	71
116:1	83, 150	123:9-124:1	155	136-137	79
116:2-3	175	123:9	110	138-139	79, 170
116:2	175	125-129	79	138:1-2	123
116:3	71, 85n, 150	125:3	85n, 109n	138:1	174
117:1-3	165	125:4	109	138:2	85n, 121
117:1	111	126:1	216	139:4	174
118:1	121	126:2	68, 69	139:5	208
118:3	110	127:2	68	140-141	79
119:6	150	127:4	68, 69	141:2	83
120:2-5	209	127:5	174	142:2	118
120:3-5	209	128:1	174		

B. The First Apology

1-14	78	10:4	142, 149	18-19	170
1:1 xiii	63, 82, 164	10:6	83, 146	18-22	78
2:1	70, 71, 83, 142,	11	78	18:5	56n
	150	11:1-2	170	18:6	170
3:1	63, 71, 83	12:2	117	19	175
3:2-4	59	12:6	71	19:6	110, 111, 150
3:2	84	12:9	110	20:1	xx, 57
3:3	58	12:10	110	20:2	57
3:5	151	12:11	71, 75, 135	20:4	57
4:1	156	13:3	111n, 115, 147,	21:1	83, 85
4:5	78		148	21:2	109
4:6	151	14	78	21:5	135, 143
4:7	110, 111	14:1-3	151	21:6	74, 143
4:8-9	56	14:1	71, 142, 149	22:2	83
5:2	83		151, 152	22:4	117
5:3-4	100, 210	14:2	119	22:5	103
5:3	57, 63, 84	14:3	150	22:6	109
5:4	84, 143	14:4	74, 174	23-60	78
6	78	14:5ff.	114	23	102n
6:1	68	15-17	78	23:1	74, 110, 111n, 114
6:2	147	15:1ff.	xix	23:2	83, 85, 104
8:2	150, 151	15:5	110	24-26	102n
8:3	111n, 170	15:7	111n	24:1	102n
8:4	61	15:9	117	25:1	102n, 109
9:3	68	16:7	110	26	74
10:1	60, 111	17:4	83, 150	26:1	102n
10:2	60, 111	18	135	26:6	156

27-60	102n	41:1	103	55:1	115
28	141	42:4	103, 121, 170	55:2	116, 174
28:1	146, 170	43:1-3	141	55:4	116
28:3	141, 145	43	141	56-58	74
29:2	xiii, xv	43-44	61	56	143
30-53	78, 102, 115	43:2	74, 111n	56:1	170
30:1	75, 79, 115, 150,	43:3	142	56:3	63, 71
	174	43:6	63, 141, 142	57:1	150
31:1-5	102	43:7	141	59-60	79
31:5	146	43:8	142	59:1	60, 66, 83
31:7	102, 122	44:1	61	59:3	147
32-53	102	44:10	71, 75	59:5	86, 111n, 146
32	102	44:11	141	60	116, 117
32:2-3	209	44:12	xx	60:1	61, 66, 117n
32:2	110	45	103	60:2-4	150
32:4	103, 150, 170,	45:5	175	60:3	118
	173, 209	46:1	xiii, 103	60:6-7	148
32:5-6	209	46:2	84, 85n, 129n	60:7	60, 147
32:7	209	46:3	54n, 56, 58	60:11	111n
32:7-8	209	46:5	103, 121, 146,	61-67	79, 164
32:8	83, 134, 155		174, 209	61	91, 164
32:9-11	209	47:1	83	61:1	134, 156,
32:9	221	48-50	102		164, 166
32:10	83, 108n, 174	48:1-3	102	61:2	112, 150, 164
32:11	105, 174	48:1	109	61:3-4	134
32:14	103	48:3	146	61:3-5	120n
33-34	102	48:4-5	103	61:3	147, 156, 157,
33	102	49	102		164
33:1	103	49:1	83	61:4	156
33:4	103, 174	50-52	170	61:9	83
33:5	110, 114, 150	50	103	61:10-11	62n
33:6	85	50:2-11	121	61:10	77, 86, 142,
33:7	103	50:12	110		156, 157, 164
33:9	87, 88	51-52	102, 103	61:11	68, 69
34	102, 103	51	103	61:12	156, 157
34:2	146	51:1-5	121	61:13	147, 156, 158
35	102, 103	51:1	117	62-63	86
35:2	174	51:7	174	62:1-4	74
35:3	87	52:3-12	170	62:3-4	87
35:9	146	52:3	117	63:1	87
36:1	88	52:4	75	63:4	83
37:1	83	53:1	146, 150	63:9	146
37:9	146	53:2	150	63:10	83, 100, 129n,
38	102	53:3	71		136n
38:7	146	53:6	68, 83, 111	63:11	87
39:1-3	175	53:10	150	63:14	87
39:2	146, 150	53:12	63, 71, 150	63:15	83, 85, 85n
39:3	110	54-58	79	63:16	103, 117
40	103	54	74, 114	64:1	146
40:1	110	54:5	209	64:3	147
40:5	83	54:6	83	64:5	86
40:7	75, 150	54:8	103	65-67	xiii, 165
41	103	55	61, 116, 117, 174	65	164, 182n

65:1	118, 158, 164, 165	66:2	108n, 164, 165	67:3	xix, 74, 114, 122, 166, 208
65:2	164, 165	66:3	xix, 74, 111, 114	67:4-5	165
65:3	147, 156, 165		165	67:5	164
65:3-5	165	66:4	146	67:6	122n
65:5	165	67	79, 121	67:7	60
66	79	67:1	164	67:8	122, 166
66:1	111, 112, 165	67:2	147, 156		

C. The Second Apology

1:1	xv 83	7:3	55, 58, 75, 84	10:8	58, 68, 75, 83, 84, 88, 146, 149, 150
1:3	xv	7:4	141	11	142
2:9	xv	7:8-9	142	12:1-2	63, 64
2:11	71	7:8	57, 84	12:3	143
2:12	xv	7:9	141	12:4	68
2:13	110	8:1	54, 56, 83, 84	12:5	55
2:15-16	xv	8:3-4	146n	12:6	83, 150
3:1ff.	56	8:3	75, 83, 146, 149	13:3	84
3:5-6	63	8:5	110	13:4	68, 69, 83, 117
3:6	58, 59, 71, 75	9:2	83	13:5	75
3:7	56	9:4	83	13:6	117, 146
4:4	63	10:1	83, 105, 149, 221	14:1	117
5:5	143	10:2	83	15:2	83
6:3	85, 104	10:3	83	15:3	55
6:5	75	10:4-8	59	15:4	75
6:16	75	10:5	58, 75		
7	141	10:5ff.	210		
7:3-4	57	10:6	146		

IV. REFERENCES TO INTERTESTAMENTAL LITERATURE

<i>A. Dead Sea Scrolls</i>		10:30	189	4:16-18	190
IQH (Thanksgiving Hymns)		11:26	189	4:19	190
		11:30	189	4:19-20	190
		14:20	189	4:21	190
4:14	188	15:23	189	5:3	189
4:25	189	15:25	188	5:25	189
4:40	188	16:4	189	IQHab (Habakkuk commentary)	
6:8-10	189	16:7	189	7:10-13	190
6:12	189	IQS (Scroll of the Rule —Manual of Discipline)		IQM (War Scroll)	
6:25	189	1:11	189	19:9	189
7:14	189	1:15	189	<i>B. Ecclesiasticus</i>	
7:19-20	189	1:24-26	189	4:28	189n
7:26	189	3:25-26	190	7:20	189n
7:28	189	4:1ff	191		
9:9-10	189	4:2	190		
9:24	189	4:15-16	190		
10:17	189				
10:20	189				
10:29	189				

<i>C. Enoch</i>		<i>Judah</i>		<i>Joseph</i>	
10:16	190	20:1	190n	1:3	189
11:2	190	20:3	190n	<i>Benjamin</i>	
21:5	190	<i>Issachar</i>		10:3	189
25:1	190	7:5	189n	<i>E. Tobit</i>	
27:3	190	<i>Dan</i>		1:3	189
99:2	190, 191	2:1	189n	3:5-6	189n
104:10-13	190	6:8	189n	4:5-6	189
106:7	190			13:6	189n
106:12	190n 190, 191n	<i>Gad</i>		<i>F. Wisdom of Solomon</i>	
<i>D. Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs</i>		3:1	189	1:6	188
<i>Reuben</i>		<i>Asher</i>		6:17	189n
3:8	189	5:4	189	6:22	189n
3:9	189n	6:1	189	12:27	188
6:9	189n			15:1	188

V. REFERENCES TO THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS

<i>A. The Didache</i> (xviii, xx, xxiii,)	45:2	201	5:2	203	
	47:1	xviii	7:1-2	203	
I-6	200	60:2	8-10	202	
3:1	200	<i>C. Ignatius of Antioch</i> (xvii, xviii, xx, xxiii)	9:1-2	203	
3:3	200		10:1	203	
3:4	200		11:1	203	
3:5	200		(1) <i>To the Ephesians</i>	12:1	203
4:1	200	1:3	13:2	203	
7-16	200	3:2	14	204	
7:1	200n	4:1-2	(3) <i>To the Trallians</i>		
8:1	200n	4:2			
9:1	200n	5:1		2:2	203
9:2	200	6:1		6-11	202
9:3	200	7-9	6:1	203	
9:4	201	7:2	7:1	131n, 203	
10:1	200n	9:1-2	8:1	203	
10:2	200	9:1	87, 203	9:1-2	203
10:3	200	9			
11	200	11:1		9:2	203
12-14	200	12:2		11:2	203
14:1	200n	13:1		12:2	204
15:1	200n	14:1		13:2	203
16:1	200n	17:2		13:3	204
16:5	201	18			
		19	xviii, 207	(4) <i>To the Romans</i>	
<i>B. First Clement</i> (xvii, xviii, xx)		19:3	203	2:2	204
		20:1	203	4:2	207
5:3-7	xviii	(2) <i>To the Magnesians</i>	4:3	xviii, 203	
31:2	201		6:1	203	
35:5	202		7:2	203, 207	
43:6	202		1:3	9:1	203

(5) <i>To the Philadelphians</i>	5	202	6:1	205n.	
1:1	203	7:1	203	6:2	205f.
3:2	203	9:2	204	6:3	205n
4:1	203	12:2	203	7-8	205
5:1	203	(7) <i>To Polycarp</i>	7:2	205n	
6-9	202		8:1	205f.	
6:2	203		8:2	205n	
8	202		9	204n	
8:1-2	203		9:2	205f.	
9:1-2	203	<i>D. Polycarp (to Philip- pians)</i> (xviii, xx, xxiii)	10-12	205n	
11:2	203		10:1	205	
(6) <i>To the Smyrneans</i>			10:2	205n	
			10:3	205n	
			11	205	
		11:2	206		
		1:2	203	12	204n
2:1	203	4	205n	12:3	205n, 206
3	207	4:1	205n	13	205
3:2	203	5:1	205n	13-14	204n
4:1	203	5:2	205f.	13:3	204n
4:3	203	5:3	205n	14	205n

VI REFERENCES TO ANCIENT WRITERS AND WORKS

Albinus 62f., 65n	Heraclitus 55, 56, 57
Aristotle 62, 65n, 135	Homer 59
Carneades 62, 142n	Hystaspes xx
Clement of Alexandria xx, 161	Ignatius (see index V)
Clement of Rome (see index V)	Intertestamental literature (see index IV)
Corpus Hermeticum 45n, 91n	Irenaeus xv, xvi, xvii, xviii, xix, xxiii, 13n, 33, 70, 77, 91, 98, 125, 173, 206n
Crescens 56, 59, 71	Justin Martyr (see index III)
Cynics 55f., 59	Letter to Flora 212n
Dead Sea Scrolls (see index IV)	Marcion 156, 160, 220
De Resurrectione 54n, 63	Marcus Aurelius 43
Didache, The (see index V)	Melito 131
Ecclesiasticus (see index IV)	Menander 143, 156
Enoch, The book of (see index IV)	Odes of Solomon 92
Ephraem 99	Origen xx, 89
Epictetus 43f., 49	Panaetius of Rhodes 57
Epicureans 56	Peripatetics 55
Epicurus 55	Philo 85, 136f.
Epiphanius 70	Plato 44f., 46, 48f., 55f., 58f., ¹ 60f., 62, 64, 132, 144, 195f.
Eusebius xiii, xvii, xxiii, 131n	— Apology 58f
Excerpta ex Theodoto 91f., 160	— Crito 58
Gospel according to the Egyptians xx	
Gospel according to the Hebrews xx	
Gospel of Philip 44, 51	
Gospel of Thomas 44, 48n, 51, 72, 81, 133	
Gospel of Truth (see index II)	

- Meno 46
 — Parmenides 48
 — Phaedo 58, 60n, 65n, 132n
 — Phaedrus 45, 48, 58, 61, 132n
 — Republic 58f., 60n, 61, 71, 132n
 — Second Epistle 60
 — Sophist 48
 — Statesman 48
 — Theaetetus 48
 — Timaeus 48, 58f., 60f., 116, 117n
 Polycarp (see index V)
 Protoevangelium, The 104
 Ptolemy 212f., 214n
 Pythagoras 55f.
- Sibylline Oracles xx
 Simon Magus 143, 156
- Socrates 45, 55f., 58f., 66, 75, 146
 Stoics 55f., 57, 62, 68f., 137, 142
- Tertullian xvii, xviii, 104, 160n
 Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs
 (see index IV)
 Theoretics 55
 Tobit (see index IV).
- Valentinians xvi, xxi, 9, 43n, 53,
 53n, 70, 70n, 76, 77, 82, 98, 98n,
 99, 125, 139, 139n, 143, 144, 144n,
 161
 Valentinus xiii, 98f.
- Wisdom of Solomon (see index IV)
 Xenophon 142

VII. REFERENCES TO MODERN WRITERS

- Altaner, B. 136n
 Amand, Dom David 142n
 Arai, S. 70n, 108n, 143n, 161n
 Archambault, G. 57n, 104, 120,
 137n, 159, 212n
 Audet, J.-P. 200n, 201n
- Bardy, G. xiii, xvii
 Barrett, C. K. 50n, 193n
 Bauer, J. B. 188n, 191n
 Bauer, W. 87n, 201n
 Blass, F. 37n
 Blunt, A. W. F. xiii, 102n, 151
 Bonner, C. 190n
 Bultmann, R. 192n, 196n, 197n
 Burrows, M. 189n
- Casey, R. P. 82, 91n
 Charles, R. H. 126, 190n
 Cremer, H. 192n
 Crum, W. E. 7, 14, 23, 27n, 34f.,
 36, 37, 39, 39n, 72, 127n, 154n,
 173n
- Davidson, A. B. 177n
 Debrunner (see Blass)
 De Faye, E. xxi, 55n, 58, 113n
 Donaldson, James 64n, 136n, 165n
 Doresse, J. xiv
 Dupont-Sommer, A. 189n
- Eichrodt, W. 178-181, 210
 Eltester, W. xiii
- Feder, A. L. 83, 136
 Frisk, H. 195n
- Gärtner, B. 72n, 133
 Gerhardsson, B. 111n
 Gildersleeve, B. L. 57n, 59, 105n
 150, 151, 156n
 Goldfahn, H. 64n
 Goodenough, E. R. xiv, 56n, 57,
 58, 61, 62, 64, 65n, 68, 69, 84n,
 85n, 86, 104n, 105, 109, 110n, 116,
 118, 119, 135, 136, 137, 138n, 143n,
 145, 156, 157, 158, 164n, 165n,
 170, 174
 Goodspeed, E. J. xiii, 63, 105n,
 115n, 151
 Grobel, K. xxii, xxiii, 3, 7, 12, 14n,
 18, 19, 22n, 25, 26n, 27n, 28n,
 30n, 31, 33, 34, 35, 38, 39n,
 40, 41, 46n, 73, 82n, 90, 92, 95n,
 105, 107, 127n, 128, 129n, 130n,
 132n, 154, 161n, 163
 Guillaumont, A. 124n
 Gulley, N. 46, 132n
- Harnack, A. xviii, 118n
 Harrison, P. N. 204n, 205n, 207n
 Harvey, W. W. xvi, 9, 98, 125n
 Heard, R. 165n
 Helm, R. W. O. 64
 Horner, G. 126n, 129n
 Hort, F. J. A. 197-199

- Hoskyns, Edwyn xi, 76, 193n,
 194n
 Huth, P. E. 117n

 Isenberg, W. W. xxii, 39n, 127n,
 131

 Jacob, E. 178, 192
 Jalland, T. G. 122n
 Jonas, Hans 51n, 53n, 91n, 92n

 Kenyon, F. xiv, xv
 Kiessling, E. 131n
 Kilpatrick, G. D. 196n
 Kittel, G. 192n

 Köhler, L. 177
 Köster, H. 74n
 Krüger, G. 102n, 151

 Labib, Pahor, xiv
 Laeuchli, S. xxi, 95n
 Lawson, John 204n
 Lebreton, J. 136
 Le Corre, René 62n
 Leipoldt, J. xxi, 74n
 Leloir, L., 99
 Lightfoot, J. B. 87, 88, 131n, 203n
 Lilje, Hans 200n
 Lock, W. 97n, 104n
 Lods, A. 190n
 Louis, Pierre 62n, 65n

 Malinine, M. xiv, 5
 Mansoor, M. 188n, 189n
 Ménard, J. E. xxiii
 Misch, G. 64n
 Moore, G. F. 189n
 Moule, C. F. D. 93n
 Moulton, J. H. 131n

 Nock, A. D. 64n, 91n

 Oepke, A. 122n, 123

 Patrick, M. M. 62n
 Payne, J. Barton 178n
 Perry, E. 184n, 186
 Piper, O. A. 69n, 74n, 84n, 85n,
 136n, 187n, 195n, 197n
 Plumley, J. M. 127n, 140n
 Preuschen, E. xx
 Procksch, Otto 178, 178n, 184n,
 185n, 192

 Puech, A. 135n, 136
 Puech, H.-Ch. xiv, xvii, 5
 Purves, G. T. 118, 119, 122n, 136n

 Quasten, J. 165n
 Quell, G. 181, 192n
 Quispel, G. xiv, xvii, 5, 139, 144n,
 212n, 214n

 Resch, A. 100
 Richardson, C. C. 165
 Riesenfeld, H. 111
 Rivière, J. 64n, 120, 121, 136n
 Roberts, C. H. 196n
 Ross, David 132n

 Sagnard, F.-M. M. xxi
 Schenke, H.-M. xiv, xvi, xxii, 11n,
 19, 22n, 25, 27n, 32n, 35, 38, 39,
 41n, 94n, 124n, 126, 127n, 129n,
 131, 140, 163
 Schlatter, A. 181n, 182n
 Segelberg, E. 27n, 167
 Smith, G. A. 184n, 185
 Smith, Morton 111n
 Snaith, N. H. 184n
 Snyder, G. F. 202
 Solmsen, F. 48
 Stählin, Otto xx
 Steindorff, G. 127n, 140n
 Story, C. I K 158n
 Strack, H. L. 188n, 194n
 Streeter, B. H. 200n, 207n
 Strycker, Émile de 104n

 Theron, D. J. 188n, 192n, 195
 Till, W. C. xiv, xxii, xxiii, 2n, 3n,
 7n, 9n, 10n, 11, 11n, 16, 22n,
 25n, 27n, 28n, 32, 35n, 36n, 39n, 46
 71, 80, 93n, 105n, 108, 124n, 126n,
 127n, 128, 129n, 133n, 154n, 163,
 163n
 Turner, H. E. W. xviii

 Ueberweg, F. 57

 van Imschoot, P. 177
 van Unnik, W. C. xiv, xviii, 50n,
 51, 51n, 98n
 von Engelhardt, M. 118, 136n
 von Otto, J. K. Th. xiii, 54n, 55n,
 57n, 102n, 104n, 105n, 117n, 122n,
 151, 156n, 157, 212n

von Rad, G. 178, 179, 180, 185n
 von Soden, H. 181n, 182n, 185n
 Vriezen, Th. C. 178, 192

Westcott, B. F. xix

Williams, A. Lukyn 121n, 170n,
 212n

Wilson, R. McL. 135n

Winter, J. G. 196n

Witt, R. E. 61n, 62n

Wolffson, H. A. 136n

Wordsworth-White 87n

Zahn, Th. xviii, 88

Zouche, R. C. xiii

VIII. REFERENCES TO SUBJECTS

adoration (see worship)

agape (see love)

All, the 1, 2, 11, 12, 13, 14, 52, 71,
 72, 88, 89, 90, 92, 96, 106, 109, 128,
 153, 162, 168, 169, 171, 172, 173

anointing 30, 31

anthropology 43, 44, 49, 130 134-
 141, 196, 216, 217

Apostolic Fathers 199-207

apostle(s) xviii-xix, 52, 53, 74, 82,
 110, 111, 113, 114, 150, 165, 166,
 174, 175, 198, 200, 203, 219, 220,
 223

aroma 25, 26, 27, 28, 147, 162, 163,
 171

authority 49, 52, 114, 157

baptism 35, 83, 86, 91, 109, 112,
 118, 147, 156, 157, 158, 164, 165,
 167, 169, 200, 201

bishop 122n, 131n, 202, 204

call (divine) xxii, 4, 7, 8, 118, 143,
 153, 182, 185, 202, 222

canon (New Testament) xvii-xx

canon (Old Testament) xvii-xx

Christian(s) xx-xxi, xxiii, 13, 18n,
 43, 50, 51, 54, 55, 58, 59, 60, 63,
 64, 66, 71, 84, 87, 110, 113, 118,
 119, 122, 134, 142, 146, 147, 149,
 150, 151, 155, 156, 158, 159, 161,
 164, 165, 166, 167, 169, 170, 173,
 174, 175, 176, 196n, 198, 200, 201,
 202, 205, 206, 209, 210, 214, 221
 Christology 20, 51, 82, 178, 206,
 210

church xvii, xviii, 13, 41, 43, 51,
 53, 82, 102, 155, 156, 173, 174, 192,
 197, 198, 200, 201, 202, 204n, 205,
 206, 207, 213, 214, 220, 223

community 1, 6, 53, 95, 110, 112,

148, 155, 156-176, 198, 200, 201,
 205n, 218

complete(ness) xvi, xxii, 1, 4, 6, 7,
 9, 10n, 14, 21, 29, 30, 94, 95, 96,
 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 124, 140, 143,
 169, 171, 172, 214

conversion(converts) 63, 64, 65, 66,
 67, 75, 102, 112, 165, 169

cosmos (see world)

covenant xvii, xviii, 80, 158, 159,
 163, 183, 184, 187, 188, 191, 210

creation 3, 60, 65, 72, 83, 85, 86,
 122, 135, 137, 140, 141, 147, 149,
 165, 166, 169, 184, 187, 196, 207,
 211, 214, 217, 222

creator 61, 70, 116, 139

cross 1, 3, 4, 8, 51, 61, 80, 103, 115,
 116, 117, 118, 120, 121, 123, 124,
 125, 126, 128, 129, 130, 133, 134,
 140, 154, 174, 205, 206, 208, 215,
 218, 219, 222, 223

crucifixion 13, 103, 115, 120, 124,
 125, 129, 150, 203

deacon 122n

death of Jesus (see passion)

demiurge (see creator)

demons, demonic 25, 58, 84, 109,
 114, 115, 118, 121, 142, 143, 144,
 145, 151, 175, 198, 222

determinism 7, 32, 52, 143, 144,
 153, 191, 222

Devil (see demons)

docetic, docetism 123, 198, 201,
 203, 205, 207

elect (chosen ones) 1, 2, 8, 9, 17, 40,
 44, 47n, 52, 125, 126, 130, 131,
 133, 143, 145, 148, 149, 153, 168,
 169, 171

episcopacy 207

eschatology 1, 7, 8, 15, 40, 56, 118, 119, 170-176, 188, 189, 190, 191, 193, 199, 201, 206, 208, 214
 eternal life (life of Christ) 132, 199, 203, 204, 206
 ethics 52, 58, 63, 74, 113, 154, 155, 185, 186
 eucharist 79, 111, 112, 122, 165, 166, 169, 201

Evangelium Veritatis

the a-gnostic 2, 3, 18, 20, 35, 47, 92, 93
 the All 1, 2, 11, 12, 13, 14, 52, 71, 72, 127, 128, 153, 162, 168, 169, 171
 anthropology 138-141, 217
 authority xviii, 52
 Bible 45, 49, 96, 97, 214, 217, 220, 222
 body 12, 15, 106
 book of the living ones 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 80, 126, 128, 129, 130, 131, 143, 162, 163, 168, 215
 community of truth 159-164, 166-169, 171-173, 176, 218
 creation 3, 71, 72
 date of composition xiii, xv-xvii
 elect ones 1, 129, 130, 133, 143
 Error 2, 3, 8, 14, 16, 17, 21, 44, 45, 47, 73, 77, 80, 89, 90, 94, 106, 108, 124, 144, 145, 215, 219, 221, 222
 eschatology 171-173, 176, 214
 existence (being-becoming) xxii, 46, 47, 48, 49, 88, 93, 217
 Father, the xvi, xxi-xxii, 69-78, 81, 82, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 104, 108, 112, 113, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 134, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, 147, 148, 149, 153, 154, 159, 160, 161, 163, 164, 168, 169, 171, 214, 215, 216, 218, 220, 221, 222, 223
 Forgetfulness 46, 73, 133, 139, 144, 153, 155
gnosis 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 16, 18, 19, 20, 24, 25, 38, 41, 49, 81, 88, 95, 100, 106, 112, 124, 125, 131, 139, 162, 166, 176, 215, 221
 results of *gnosis* 5, 6, 7, 8, 13,

Evangelium Veritatis (cont.)

14, 15, 16, 18, 33, 38, 40, 47, 49, 217
 Holy Spirit in 13, 19, 20, 26, 27, 28, 42, 81, 104, 147, 148, 163, 176, 222
 Ignorance 43, 45, 49, 89, 95, 107, 125, 216
 incarnation 12, 20, 21, 47, 50, 76, 81, 97
 Jesus Christ in xx, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15, 20, 21, 22, 23, 35, 47, 49, 51, 72
 death of Jesus in 3, 6, 13, 71, 76, 80, 123-134, 215, 219
 Judaism 23, 34, 92
 judgment 15, 16
 life on earth of gnostic 23-25
 Logos xxi, 11, 12, 15, 28, 31, 32, 33, 51n, 81-88, 100, 105, 106, 169, 220, 221
 name 17, 33-38, 160, 161
nous 43, 44, 45, 48, 49, 81, 112
 New Testament in xvii, 4, 40, 50, 51, 52, 53, 81, 90, 95, 96, 97, 99, 107, 113, 129-130, 132, 148, 149, 216
 parables (see separate entry)
 anointing-seals 30-31, 88
 aroma 25-28, 88, 171
 children from adult 92-93
 complete book 9, 10, 94-95
 doctor 29-30, 99-101
 drunkard 91-92
 father and offspring 4, 90-91
 fire 14-15, 96
 fog 2, 89-90
 ignorant one 9-10, 94-95
 lost sheep 21, 22, 97-99
 nightmare 18-19, 93-94
 opportune time 17, 47, 88
 vessels 14-17, 96, 97
 Platonism in 44, 45, 46, 48, 49
pleroma 38, 100, 112, 154
 redemption 23, 27-28, 33, 38, 40-41, 124, 155, 222
 revelation xxii, 44, 45, 49, 73
 resurrection 6, 123-124, 132-134
 salvation (see redemption)
 sin 18, 29
 Son 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 47, 81, 106, 149, 171

Evangelium Veritatis (cont.)

- Stoicism in 43, 44, 49
 title of xiv, 51n
 world xxii, 14, 15, 38, 43, 48, 139, 168, 169, 221
 evil xxii, 1, 61, 134, 138, 141-145, 165, 166, 190, 191, 221, 222
 exile 187
 existence, existential 1, 3, 7, 8, 14, 15, 17, 18, 33, 34, 35, 46, 47, 48, 49, 52, 70, 71, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 107, 139, 141, 142, 164, 166, 172, 196, 217, 222
 faith xx, 27n, 49, 119n, 136, 150, 155, 157, 158, 161, 185, 186, 193, 194, 199, 201, 202, 214, 218
 faithfulness 181, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187
 fate 57, 141, 142, 145
 flesh 6, 20, 107, 109, 132, 133, 138, 140, 170, 206, 220
 forgiveness 29, 118, 134, 197, 205
 free will 61, 79, 142, 143, 144, 222
 gnosis (gnostic) xxi, 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 31, 33, 35, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43n, 45, 47, 49, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 100, 101, 106, 107, 109, 112, 113, 123, 125, 127, 128, 131, 132, 133, 134, 139, 140, 144, 145, 153, 154, 155, 160, 167, 171, 176, 208, 215, 216, 217, 218, 220
 Gospel of Truth (see *Evangelium Veritatis*)
 gospel(s) xv, xvi-xix, 1, 2, 3, 5, 12, 21, 25, 26, 27, 40, 50, 51, 52, 53, 73, 74, 80, 81n, 90, 94, 96, 97, 99, 101, 110, 113, 114, 123, 124, 125, 141, 143, 165, 169, 192, 194, 196, 197, 198, 202, 207, 208, 215, 217
 gospels (apocryphal) xiii
 grace 6, 25, 30, 70, 100, 117, 118, 146, 193, 205, 217, 218
 Hellenism 67, 195, 196
 hermeneutic of *Ev. Ver.* 214, 215
 hermeneutic of Justin Martyr 208, 209, 212
 history (historical) xxi, 1, 5, 13, 75, 76, 82, 83, 86, 88, 100, 101, 112, 123, 124, 126, 130, 162, 176, 181, 183, 185, 187, 191, 192, 194, 196, 198, 199, 208, 209, 211, 214, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223
 Holy Spirit 13, 16, 19, 20, 26, 27, 42, 60, 78, 81, 104, 107, 116, 134, 140, 147, 148, 149, 157, 163, 167, 175, 176, 194, 196, 197, 198, 199, 201, 222
 hope 27n, 28
hulic 15, 20, 25, 26, 44, 49, 52, 107, 138, 141, 172
 incarnation 12, 15, 20, 21, 34, 47, 50, 81, 84, 85, 97, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 129n, 134, 136, 149, 170n, 193, 196, 197, 199, 205, 206, 207, 208, 214, 215, 220-222
 intertestamental literature 188-192
 Israel 71, 173, 210
 Judaeizers 202, 203
 judgment 15-17, 57, 59, 61, 97, 107, 118, 145, 151, 158, 170, 173, 190, 206
 justification by faith 150
 Justin Martyr
 anthropology 135, 140
 community of truth 155, 159, 163-166, 169, 170, 173-176
 conversion 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 79
 cosmos 116-117
 creation 60, 70, 71, 85, 86, 165, 221, 222
 date xiii-xv
 eschatology 170, 173-176
 evil 61, 141-143, 145, 221
 faith 149, 150, 155
 God 54, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 100, 103, 104, 115, 117, 118, 121, 122, 123, 136, 137, 138, 142, 146, 149, 150, 151, 152, 156, 163-166, 174, 207, 208, 210, 213, 214, 220, 221, 222
 Holy Spirit 65, 66, 147, 175, 176
 incarnation 54, 75, 78, 129n, 102-105, 108, 208, 219
 Jesus Christ 59, 61, 66, 67, 69, 77, 78, 79, 80, 83, 102, 109-112, 114-120, 146, 166, 175, 208, 209, 210, 213, 214, 221, 222
 Logos xix, 58, 59, 66, 69, 83, 88, 100-101, 103, 104, 135, 136, 142, 145, 146, 149, 152, 208, 220, 221, 222

Justin Martyr (cont.)

nous 65, 66, 67, 83, 84, 135, 137
 New Testament 149, 173
 Old Testament xviii, 66, 67, 74, 75, 79, 80, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 100, 103, 104, 109, 114, 115, 116, 119, 120, 121, 133, 135, 136, 149, 150, 158, 159, 209, 210-214, 221-222
 philosophy 53, 54, 55, 64, 65-67
 Plato and Socrates 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 63, 64, 75, 79, 84, 116, 144, 146
 Platonism 61, 62, 63, 65, 67
 revelation 73
 resurrection of Jesus 79, 114-116, 121-123, 137, 174, 219
 resurrection of believers 170, 175
 sabbath 121-123, 166
 Son 61, 69, 149, 151
 Stoics 56, 57, 68, 84, 136, 137, 142
 text xiii
 truth xviii, 54, 57, 62, 63, 65, 66, 207-214
 knowledge xvi, xxii, 6, 13, 45, 58, 59, 62, 91, 92, 118, 127, 146, 168, 186, 197, 198
 law 80, 102, 115, 120, 150, 159, 184, 189, 190, 200, 202, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 212n, 213
 living book 4, 8-15, 51n, 53n, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 143, 162, 163, 168, 215
 Logos 11, 12, 15, 16, 28, 31, 54, 58, 59, 68, 78, 81, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 100, 103, 104, 105, 106, 122, 134, 135, 136, 140, 146, 149, 164, 169, 176, 193, 208, 210, 214, 220, 221, 222
 Lord's day (see Sunday)
 Lord's supper (see eucharist)
 love 12, 27n, 40, 41, 52, 105, 106, 108, 117, 205, 218
 Middle, the 89, 94, 112, 143, 144, 145, 221
 miracles 109, 110, 113
 Montanists xvi
 mystery 1, 34, 69, 123, 157, 160, 161, 167
 name 7, 17, 33-38, 47, 113, 160, 161, 163, 222

new birth (see redemption)

New Testament xvii-xx 1, 4, 26, 29, 31, 49, 50, 52, 53, 73, 81, 87, 88, 95, 97, 99, 107, 111, 113, 119, 122, 123, 127, 131, 148, 149, 170n, 175, 176, 188, 192-199, 204, 205, 206, 209, 217, 218, 220
nous 5, 43, 44, 45, 48, 65, 135, 137, 140, 143, 150, 173, 195
 Old Testament xvii-xx, 50n, 67, 74, 79, 83, 108, 115, 121, 123, 161, 170, 177-188, 191, 192, 194, 199, 201, 202, 206, 210, 214, 220, 221
 oneness (see unity)
 parable xxii, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 29, 30, 31, 47, 52, 70, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 96, 97, 98, 100, 101, 127, 128, 148, 154, 155, 160, 163, 215, 219
 paradise 31, 38, 41
 passion (Christ's) 50, 114, 121, 134, 202, 203, 207, 209, 215, 219
 passover 119, 121, 213
 philosophy xx-xxi, xxiii, 43-49, 53-56, 64, 66, 67, 68, 96, 135, 144, 195-199, 209, 221, 222, 223
 power (of God, of the cross) 104, 145-149, 159, 174, 175, 186, 197, 218, 221, 222
 prophecy, prophets xix, 37, 52, 53, 65, 66, 67, 74, 75, 79, 80, 83, 87, 88, 100, 102, 103, 108, 109, 110, 111, 114, 115, 116, 121, 133, 135, 147, 149, 150, 157, 159, 166, 173, 194, 202, 203, 208, 209, 210, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223
 proselyte 158, 159
 punishment (see judgment)
 purpose of God (see will of God)
 redemption xvi, 26, 33, 38, 41, 43, 52, 76, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 124, 128, 133, 134, 155, 156, 157, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 169, 196, 199, 216, 217, 221, 222
 regeneration (see redemption)
 repentance 28, 71, 143
 resurrection 6, 50, 133, 134, 140, 170, 174, 175, 194, 197, 198, 202, 203, 212, 219, 223
 revelation (manifestation) xviii, 1 2, 4, 5, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 20, 24, 33, 44-45, 49, 54, 72, 73, 75, 77, 80, 82, 106, 130, 147, 161n, 178, 179, 180,

- 183, 184, 187, 191, 193, 195, 200, 210, 214, 217, 218, 220, 221
- sabbath 123, 211
- sacrament 35, 87, 91, 134, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 175, 194, 200, 201.
- salvation, Savior xvi, 5, 23, 28, 96, 98, 99, 101, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 123, 124, 133, 150, 151, 152, 158, 165, 195, 205, 212, 212n
- Scriptures 45, 49, 67, 74, 83, 136, 201, 210, 223
- second coming 103, 118, 170, 173, 174, 175, 176, 200
- shepherd (Jesus) 21-23, 97-98, 101
- sin 18n, 29, 118, 119, 144n, 205, 211
- Son (Jesus) 10, 11, 13, 20, 21, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 61, 67, 79, 82, 89, 107
- sons (believers) 25, 26, 28, 34, 42
- soteriology 199, 200, 202, 219
- soul 50, 65, 66, 77, 135, 137, 139, 140, 141, 143, 145, 186
- sovereignty (see determinism)
- Sunday xix, 121, 122, 165, 175, 200, 203, 209
- synagogue xix, 4, 112
- tabernacle 117
- teacher, teaching 4, 10, 21, 52, 58, 105, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 198, 201, 205, 206, 215, 221
- testamentary will 128, 130-134
- tradition 111, 112, 113, 202
- truth
and Apostolic Fathers xvii-xx, 199-207
and eschatology 186, 187, 189-191, 192, 193, 195, 196, 199, 201, 208, 214, 222
and faith 185, 186, 187, 193-194
and history 179, 180, 183, 184-187, 191, 196, 198, 199, 206, 208, 209, 214, 217, 218
and incarnation 12, 20, 21, 47, 50, 76, 81, 97, 105-109, 134, 215, 222-223
and intertestamental literature 187-191
and Jesus Christ xx, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15, 20, 21, 22, 23, 35, 47, 49, 51, 72, 90, 93, 100, 112, 113, 215, 216, 218, 220, 221, 222, 223
and law 188, 189, 191, 200, 206, 210, 211, 212, 213
and the New Testament xvii-xx, 192-199, 200
and the Old Testament xvii-xx, 177-188, 194-195, 201, 202
and philosophical background, xx-xxii, 195-199
- typology 79, 116, 121, 150, 208, 213
- unity (oneness) 13, 14, 40, 44, 45, 49, 54, 55, 94, 112, 163, 164, 165, 166, 168, 172, 201, 203, 212, 217
- will (of God) 7, 9, 13, 17, 25, 32, 33, 47, 186, 187, 188, 214, 217, 218, 221
- world 1, 2, 9, 14, 15, 16, 23, 26, 27, 29, 32, 38, 41, 43, 48, 49, 52, 57, 66, 68, 69, 77, 81, 93, 95, 96, 112, 116, 117, 130, 133, 139, 144, 145, 162, 166, 167, 168, 169, 171, 172, 185, 190, 193, 195, 196, 199, 201, 206, 213, 221
- World Soul 48, 49, 61
- worship (er) 28, 74, 79, 89, 121, 122, 147, 169, 174, 175, 183, 187, 190n, 191, 197, 202, 206, 223